Columbia University
in the City of New York

LIBRARY



INSTITUTES

OF

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,

ANCIENT AND MODERN,

IN FOUR BOOKS,

MUCH CORRECTED, ENLARGED, AND IMPROVED FROM THE PRIMARY AUTHORITIES.

BY JOHN LAWRENCE VON MOSHEIM, D. D.,

CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GOTTINGEN.

A NEW AND LITERAL TRANSLATION, FROM THE ORIGINAL LATIN, WITH COPIOUS ADDITIONAL NOTES, ORIGINAL AND SELECTED.

BY JAMES MURDOCK, D. D.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED.

NEW-YORK:
STANFORD & SWORDS, 137, BROADWAY.

1849.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1839, by
JAMES MURDOCK,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Connecticut District.

931
M 8542
v. 3.

INSTITUTES

OF

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,

UNDER THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK IV.

EMBRACING

EVENTS FROM THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE REFORMATION BY LUTHER, TO THE YEAR A.D. 1700.

Gift
Dr. JAMES PECK
June 7, 1913

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. The Order of the Narration must be changed.—§ 2. The History divided into the General and the Particular.—§ 3. The general History.—§ 4. The particular History.—§ 5. History of the Reformation.

§ 1. In narrating the ecclesiastical affairs of modern times, the same order cannot be followed as was pursued in the preceding periods. For the state of the Christian world having undergone a great change in the sixteenth century, and a much greater number of associations than formerly being found among the followers of Christ, differing widely in doctrines and institutions, and regulating their conduct by different principles; all the various transactions among professed Christians, can by no means be exhibited in one continued series, and so as to form one well-arranged picture. On the contrary, as the bond of union among Christians was severed, their history must be distributed into compartments, corresponding with the division of the Christian world into its principal sects.

§ 2. Yet many events occurred, which affected the whole Christian world, and the state of religion generally, or were not confined to any particular community. And as the knowledge of these general facts, throws much light on the history of the particular communities, as well as on the general state of the Christian world, they ought to be stated separately and by themselves. Hence the work before us will be divided into two principal parts; the one, the *general history* of the Christian church, and the other, the *particular*.

§ 3. The *general history* will embrace all those facts and occurrences, which may be predicated of the Christian religion as such, or absolutely considered; and which in some sense, affected the whole Christian world, rent unhappily as it was by divisions. Of course, we shall here describe the enlargement of the boundaries of Christendom or their contraction, without regard to the particular sects that were instrumental in these changes. Nor shall we omit those institutions and doctrines which were received by all the Christian communities, or by the principal part of them, and which thus produced changes very extensive and general.

§ 4. In the *particular history*, we shall take a survey of the several communities into which Christians were distributed. And here we may properly make two classes of sects. *First*, we may consider what occurred in the more *ancient communities* of Christians, whether in the East, or in the West. *Secondly*, what occurred in the more *recent communities*, those that arose after the reformation of both doctrine and discipline in Germany. In describing the condition and character of each particular sect, we shall pursue as far as practicable, the method pointed out in the general Introduction to these Institutes. For according to our conceptions, the less a person recedes from this method, the less will he probably omit of what is necessary to a full knowledge of the history of each individual community.

§ 5. The most important of all the events that occurred among Christians, after the fifteenth century, nay, the greatest of all events affecting the Christian world since the birth of the Saviour, was that celebrated religious and ecclesiastical revolution called the *Reformation*. Commencing from small beginnings in Saxony, it not only spread in a short space of time over all Europe, but also affected in no slight degree the other quarters of the globe; and it may be justly regarded as the first and principal cause of all those great ecclesiastical, and even those civil revolutions and changes, which have rendered the history of the subsequent times quite to the present day so interesting and important. The face of all Europe was changed, after that event; and our own times are experiencing, and future times will experience, both the inestimable advantages that arose from it, and the vast evils to which it gave occasion.(1) The history of such an event therefore, an event from which all others in a measure took their rise, demands a distinct and a prominent place. We now proceed to give a compendious view of the modern history of the Christian church, according to the method here proposed.(2)

(1) [See *C. Villiers*, on the Spirit and Influence of the Reformation; from the French, 1807, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(2) [*Dr. Mosheim* still proceeds by centuries. On the *sixteenth* century, he divides his history into three *Sections*. I. The history of the *Reformation*; in four chapters. II. The *general history* of the church; in a single chapter. III. The *particular history* of the several sects or communities; in two Parts. Part *first* embraces the ancient communities; viz., the *Latin*, and the *Greek* or Oriental churches, in distinct chapters. Part *second* includes, in separate chapters, the history of the *Lutheran*, the *Reformed*, the *Anabaptist* or *Mennonite*, and the *Socinian*, churches.—On the *seventeenth* century, he makes but *two* sections. I. The *general history*, in a single chapter. II. The *particular history*, divided into Parts and Chapters, as in the preceding century; except, that among the *modern* sects, he assigns distinct chapters to the *Arminians*, the *Quakers*, and an additional chapter to several *minor* sects.—*Tr.*]

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

OF THE

SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

SECTION I.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION.

ARRANGEMENT OF THIS SECTION.

THE history of the *Reformation* is too extensive, to be comprehended in one unbroken narrative, without wearying the learner. For the convenience therefore of such as are just entering on the study of church history, and to aid their memories, we shall divide this section into four parts [or chapters].

The FIRST will describe the *state of the Christian church at the commencement of the Reformation.*

The SECOND will detail the *history of the incipient Reformation, till the presentation of the Augsburg Confession to the emperor.*

The THIRD will continue *the history from that period, till the commencement of the war of Smalcald.*

The FOURTH will carry it *down to the peace granted to the friends of the Reformation*, A.D. 1555.—This distribution arises naturally from the history itself.(1)

(1) The *historians of the Reformation*, as well the primary as the secondary, and both the general and the particular, are enumerated by *Phil. Fred. Hane*, (who is himself to be ranked among the better writers on this subject), in his Historia sacrorum a B. Luthero emendatorum, part i., cap. i., p. 1, &c., and by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, in his Centifolium Lutheranum, pt. ii., cap. 187, p. 863, [also by *Walch*, Biblioth. Theol., tom. iii., p. 618]. The principal of these historians must be consulted, by those who desire proof of what we shall briefly relate in this section. For it would be needless, to be repeating every moment the names of *Sleidan*, *Seckendorf*, and the others, who stand pre-eminent in this branch of history.

CHAPTER I.

STATE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH WHEN THE REFORMATION COMMENCED.

§ 1. At the Beginning of the Century, all was tranquil.—§ 2. Complaints against the Pontiffs and the Clergy, were ineffectual.—§ 3. Revival of Learning.—§ 4. The Pontiffs *Alexander* VI. and *Pius* III.—§ 5. *Julius* II.—§ 6. The Council of Pisa.—§ 7. *Leo* X.—§ 8. Avarice of the Pontiffs.—§ 9. They are inferior to Councils.—§ 10. Corruption of the inferior Clergy.—§ 11. State of the Monks.—§ 12. The Dominicans.—§ 13. State of the Universities and of Learning.—§ 14. Theology.—§ 15. Liberty to dispute about Religion.—§ 16. The public Religion.—§ 17. Miserable Condition of the People.—§ 18. A Reformation desired.—§ 19. The Mystics.

§ 1. When the century began, no danger seemed to threaten the pontiffs. For those grievous commotions, which had been raised in the preceding centuries by the Waldenses, the Albigenses, the Beghards, and others, and afterwards by the Bohemians, had been suppressed and extinguished by the sword and by crafty management. The Waldenses who survived in the valleys of Piedmont, fared hard, and had few resources; and their utmost wish was, that they might transmit as an inheritance to their posterity, that obscure corner of Europe which lies between the Alps and the Pyrenees. Those Bohemians who were displeased with the Romish doctrines, from their want of power and their ignorance, could attempt nothing; and therefore, were rather despised than feared.

§ 2. Complaints indeed were uttered, not only by private persons but by the most powerful sovereigns, and by whole nations, against the haughty domination of the Roman pontiffs, the frauds, the violence, the avarice, and the injustice of the court of Rome, the insolence, the tyranny, and the extortion of the papal legates, the crimes, the ignorance, and the extreme profligacy of the priests of all orders, and of the monks, and finally of the unrighteous severity and the partiality of the Romish laws; and desires were now publicly expressed, as had been the case in generations long gone by, that there might be a *Reformation* of the church, in its head and in its members, and that the subject might be taken up in some general council.(1) But these complaints the pontiffs could safely set at defiance. For the authors of them entertained no doubts of the supreme power of the sovereign pontiffs in matters of religion; nor did they themselves go about the work they so much desired, but concluded to wait for relief either from Rome itself or from a council. Yet it was manifest, that so long as the power of the pontiffs remained inviolate, the opulence and the corruptions of the church and of the clergy could not be diminished in any considerable degree.

(1) These accusations have been collected in great abundance, by the most learned writers. See, among many others, *Val. Ern. Löscher's* Acta et Documenta Reformationis, tom. i., cap. v., &c., p. 105, &c., cap. ix., p. 181, &c., and *Ern. Salom. Cyprian's* Preface to *William Ern. Tenzel's* Historia Reformat., Lips., 1717, 8vo. The complaints of the Germans in particular, respecting the wrongs done by the pontiffs and the clergy, are exhibited by *Jac. Fred. Georgius*, in his Gravamina Imperatoris et nationis German. adversus sedem Roman., cap. vii., p. 261, &c. Nor do the more intelligent and candid among the adherents to the pontiffs, at this day deny that the church, before *Luther* arose, was grossly corrupt.

§ 3. Nor were the pontiffs any more alarmed, by the happy revival of learning in many countries of Europe, and the consequent vast increase of well-informed men. The revival of learning, by dissipating the clouds of ignorance, awakened in many minds the love of truth and of liberty; and among the learned men, there were many, who as appears from the example of *Erasmus* and others, facetiously ridiculed and satirized the perverse conduct of the priests, the superstitions of the times, the corruptions of the court of Rome, and the rustic manners and the barbarism of the monks. But the root of all the evil and of the public calamity, namely, the jurisdiction of the pontiffs, which was falsely called *canonical*, and the inveterate prejudice respecting a vicegerent of Christ located at Rome, no one dared resolutely attack. And the pontiffs very justly concluded, that so long as these ramparts remained entire, their sovereignty and the tranquillity of the church would be secure, whatever menaces and assaults some persons might offer. Besides, they had at their disposal, both punishments with which to coerce the refractory, and honours and emoluments with which to conciliate the more daring and contentious.

§ 4. Hence, the bishops of Rome reigned securely, and free from all fear; and they indulged their lusts, and all their vicious propensities, as freely as their innate depravity demanded. *Alexander* VI., a monster of a man, and inferior to no one of the most abandoned tyrants of antiquity, marked the commencement of the century with his horrid crimes and villanies. He died suddenly, A.D. 1503, from poison which he had prepared for others, if the common report is true, or from old age and sickness, if others are to be believed.(2) His successor, *Pius* III., died at the end of twenty-six days; and was followed by *Julian de Roveria*, under the name of *Julius* II., who obtained the pontificate by fraud and bribery.

§ 5. That this *Julius* II. possessed, besides other vices, very great ferocity, arrogance, vanity, and a mad passion for war, is proved by abundant testimony. In the first place, forming an alliance with the emperor and the king of France, he made war upon the Venetians.(3) He next laid siege to Ferrara. And at last, drawing the Venetians, the Swiss, and the Spaniards to engage in the war with him, he made an attack upon *Lewis* XII. the king of France. Nor, so long as he lived, did he cease from embroiling all Europe. Who can doubt, that under a vicar of Jesus Christ that spent his time in camps, and was ambitious of the fame of a great warrior, everything both in church and state must have gone to ruin, and both the discipline of the church and the very spirit of religion have become prostrate?

§ 6. Yet amid these evils, there appeared some prospect of the ardently and long-wished-for reform. For *Lewis* XII. king of France, published a threat stamped upon the coins he issued, that he would completely overthrow the Romish power; which he designated by the name of *Babylon*.(4)

(2) See *Alexander Gordon's* Life of Alexander VI., French from the English, Amsterd., 1732, 2 vols 8vo; also another life of him, by a very learned and ingenious man, written with more candour and moderation, and, together with a Life of *Leo* X., subjoined to the first volume of the Histoire du droit public ecclesiastique François, par Mr. D. B., Lond, 1752, 4to.

(3) See *Du Bos*, Histoire de la Ligue du Cambray, Hague, 1710, 2 vols. 8vo.

(4) See *Christ. Sigism. Liebe's* Commentatio de numis Ludovici XII. epigraphe; Perdam Babylonis Nomen, insignibus, Lips., 1717, 8vo. Compare, however, the Thesaurus Epistolicus Crozianus, tom. i, p. 238, 243. *Colonia's* Histoire litter de la ville de Lyon, tom. ii., p. 443, &c., and oth-

Moreover some of the cardinals of the Romish court, relying on the authority of this king and of the emperor, summoned a council at Pisa in the year 1511, to curb the madness of the pontiff, and to deliberate on measures for a general reformation of the inveterate corruptions in religion. But *Julius*, relying on the power of his allies and on his own resources, laughed at this opposition. Yet not to neglect means for frustrating these designs, he called another council to meet in the Lateran palace, A.D. 1512.(5)

ers; for it is well known, that there has been much dispute respecting these coins, and the object of them. [*Liebe* has given engravings of these coins. On the one side was the king's likeness, and his title; on the other side, the arms of France surrounded with the inscription: *Perdam Babilonis* (instead of *Babylonis*) *Nomen*; or also simply, *Perdam Babilonem*. *Harduin* understood *Babylon* here, to denote the city of *Cairo* in Egypt; and he explained the coin of a military expedition, which Lewis contemplated against the Turks. But *Liebe* has fully confuted this ingenious Jesuit; and has shown, that *Babylon* means *Rome* together with the pope, and that the threatened vengeance was aimed by the king against the pontiff. And that the French church was not opposed to the designs of the king, appears from the conclusions of the council of Tours, which are mentioned in the following note. See *Du Pin's* Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs ecclesiast., tom. xiii, p. 13, 14, and *Gerdes*, Historia Evangelii seculo xvi. per Europam renovati, tom. iv., Append No. 1.—*Schl.*]

(5) *Jo. Harduin's* Concilia, tom. ix., p. 1559, &c. [*Lewis* XII. was not an enemy to be despised. He made preparations for a war against the pope, which were certainly great and imposing. He assembled the clergy of France, first at Orleans and then at Tours, (see *Harduin*, l. c., p. 1555), and proposed to them the following questions.—1. Is it lawful for the pope to make war upon temporal princes, whose territories do not belong to the church? *No.*—2. May the prince in such a case, lawfully oppose force to force, and fall upon the territories of the church, not to conquer and retain them but to disable the pope from carrying on the war? *Yes.*—3. May a prince refuse obedience to a pope, who is his enemy and who makes unjust war upon him? *Yes:* so far as is necessary for his own security and that of his people.—4. In that case, how are those affairs to be conducted which ordinarily are referred to the decision of the pontiff? *Answer:* in the manner prescribed by the *Pragmatic Sanction*.—5. May a Christian prince defend with arms another prince who is under his protection, against the assaults of the pope? (This question referred to the duke of Ferrara, who was involved in war with the pope.) *Yes.*—6. If the pope and a prince disagree, whether a case between them belongs to the ecclesiastical or the civil jurisdiction, and the prince wishes to leave it to referees, and the pope will not consent but draws the sword, may the prince stand on the defensive, and call on his allies to help him? *Yes.*—7. If a pope pronounces an unjust sentence against a prince, [with whom he is at variance, and who cannot safely appear at Rome to defend his cause], is that sentence binding? *No.*—8. If the pope in such a case should lay the prince and his realm under an interdict, what is to be done? *Answer:* Such an interdict would be itself a nullity. [See the questions and answers, at full length, in *Gerdes'* Historia Evangelii Sæculo xvi. per Europam renovati, tom. iv., Append. No. 1.—*Tr.*] After these preparatory steps, *Lewis* went still farther, and purposed to have a general council called against the pope. The emperor *Maximilian* united in the measure, and three cardinals lent their aid to the business. The council was opened at Pisa, A.D. 1511, and after a few sessions, removed to Milan. The pope was cited by the fathers to appear at Milan; and was afterwards suspended. But as the pope had now brought about a reconciliation with the emperor, and as nearly all the assembled prelates were from France, the decrees of this council were no where received except in France. The council assembled by the pope in the Lateran church at Rome, to oppose that of Pisa, was somewhat larger than the other, yet quite too small for a general council; and besides, was composed almost exclusively of Italians. It may therefore be regarded rather as a provincial than as a general council. It held 11 sessions in all. In the first, it was determined to take up the subjects of the division caused by the council of Pisa, the reformation of the church, a pacification among Christian princes, and a war against the Turks. In the second, the convention at Pisa was declared to be irregular. In the third, the emperor having now sided with this council, severe bulls were issued against France. In the fourth, the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction was taken up. In the fifth, simony in the election of popes was forbidden, and the French church cited to appear on the subject of the

In this body, the acts of the assembly at Pisa, were spiritedly condemned, and annulled: and undoubtedly, severe anathemas would have followed against *Lewis* and others, if death had not overtaken the audacious pontiff in his preparatory steps, A.D. 1512.

§ 7. His successor, *Leo* X., of the family of Medici, who was elected in the year 1513, was of a milder disposition, but no better guardian of religion and piety. The friend of learned men, and himself learned according to the standard of that age, he devoted a part of his time to conversation with literary men, but a larger portion of it to the gratification of his appetites and to amusements, and was averse from all cares and business, prodigal, luxurious, and vain; perhaps also, according to a current report, positively impious. Yet he did not neglect the interests and the grandeur of the Romish see. For he took good care, that nothing should be sanctioned in the Lateran council which *Julius* had assembled and left sitting, favourable to the long-wished-for *reformation;* and at Bologna, A.D. 1515, he persuaded *Francis* I. king of France, to allow the abrogation of the ordinance called the *Pragmatic Sanction*, which had long been odious to the pontiffs, and to cause another, called the *Concordate*, to be imposed on his subjects with their extreme indignation.(6)

§ 8. Besides the intolerable thirst for dominion and for oppressing everybody, which tormented these pontiffs, they had an insatiable craving for money; which they caused to flow from every province of the Christian world towards Rome, in order to support their power and to purchase them friends. And it would seem not preposterous or unsuitable, for the heads of the Christian republic to demand tribute from their subjects. For who can deny, that the sovereign ruler of a commonwealth (and such the pontiffs claimed to be) is entitled to a revenue from the whole state? But as the term *tribute* was too offensive, and would excite the indignation of the temporal sovereigns, the pontiffs managed the affair more discreetly, and robbed the unwary of their money, by various artifices concealed under an appearance of religion.(7) Among these artifices, what were called *indul-*

above-named Sanction. Soon after, *Julius* died; and in the sixth and seventh sessions, the council was adjourned, both by the new pope *Leo* X. and by the votes of its members. In the eighth session, *Lewis* XII. was present by his envoys; and the pope forbid the studying of philosophy, more than five years, without proceeding to theology and jurisprudence. The ninth and tenth sessions were devoted to trivial matters, which did not satisfy the expectations raised concerning a reformation of the church. At length the council closed, in its eleventh session, May 16th, 1517.—*Schl.*]

(6) The Pragmatic Sanction of the French, is extant in *Harduin's* Concilia, tom. viii., p. 1949. The *Concordate* is in the same work, tom. ix., p. 1867; also in *Godfr. Will. Leibnitz*, Mantissa Codicis Diplomat., pt. i., p. 158, &c. Add pt. ii., p. 358, &c. For a history of the Pragmatic Sanction, and of the *Concordate* that succeeded it, see *Gilbert Burnet's* History of the Reformation of England, vol. iii., p. 3. *Cæs. Egasse de Boulay's* Historia Acad. Paris., tom. vi., p. 61–109. *Du Clos*, Histoire de Louis XI.; Histoire du droit Ecclesiastique François, tome i., Diss. ix., p. 415. Add, Menagiana, tom. iii., p. 285. [See also the preceding volume, p. 435, note (24).—*Tr.*]

(7) [Whoever would learn the whole art and mystery of the financial concerns of the Romish court, may consult *Le Bret's* Magazine for civil and ecclesiastical history, and the ecclesiastical laws of Catholic states, vol. ii., p. 605, and vol. iii., p. 3, where is an essay, entitled, History of the Romish chancery regulations; and also an essay by a learned Neapolitan, on the Romish chancery regulations and the reservation of benefices. And if any one wishes to form an idea of the productiveness of these chancery regulations, he need only compute the part of them relating to *Annates*. Of these *Luther* made a computation, in his tract entitled, Legatio Adriani papæ, &c., which contains an essay

gences, that is, liberty to buy off the punishments of their sins by contributing money to pious uses, held a distinguished place. And to these recourse was had, as often as the papal treasury became exhausted, to the immense injury of the public interests. Under some plausible, but for the most part false pretext, the ignorant and timorous people were beguiled with the prospect of great advantage, by the hawkers of indulgences, who were in general base and profligate characters.(8)

§ 9. But notwithstanding the reverence for the sovereign pontiffs was extremely high, yet the more intelligent, especially among the Germans, the French, English, and Flemings, denied their entire exemption from error, and their superiority to all law. For after the period of the Councils of Constance and Basil, the belief prevailed, among all except the monks, the Romish parasites, and the superstitious vulgar, that the pontiff's authority was inferior to that of a general council, that his decisions were not infallible, and that he might be deposed by a council, if he was guilty of manifest errors and gross crimes, or plainly neglected the duties of his station. And hence arose those high expectations and those intense desires for a general council, in the minds of the wiser portions of the age; and those frequent appeals to such a future council, whenever the Romish court committed offences against justice and piety.

§ 10. The subordinate rulers and teachers of the church, eagerly followed the example of their head and leader. Most of the bishops, with the *canons* their associates, led luxurious and jovial lives, in the daily commission of sins, and squandered in the gratification of their lusts those funds, which the preceding generations had consecrated to God and to the relief of the poor. Most of them likewise treated the people subject to their control much more rigorously and harshly, than the civil magistrates and princes treated their dependants. The greater part of the priests, on account of their indolence, their unchastity, their avarice, their love of pleasure, their ignorance, and their levity, were regarded with utter con-

on the nature of Annates; Wittemb., 1538, 4to. A still fuller account may be seen in the tract published by *Marcellus Silber*, at Campo Flore near Rome, 1514, under the title of Taxa cancellariæ Apostolicæ et Taxa sanctæ pœnitentiæ; and which was republished at Cologne by *Colini*, 1515, and at Paris, 1520, and afterwards in the Supplement to the Councils, vol. vi. It occurs also in the Oceanus Juris, or the Tractatus Tractatuum, tom. xv., part i., p. 368, &c. [It was frequently published, with notes and comments, and some diversity in the text; whence the Catholics placed it in the list of books prohibited, as being perverted by the Protestants. See *Bayle's* Dictionnaire hist. crit., articles *Pinet*, and *Bank* (Lawrence).—*Tr.*] It contains the tariff of dues to be paid to the papal chancery for all absolutions, dispensations, &c. According to this book, a dean may be absolved from a murder, for twenty crowns. A bishop or abbot, for three hundred livres, may commit a murder whenever he pleases. And for one third of that sum, any clergyman may be guilty of unchastity, under the most abominable circumstances. The ingenuous French Catholic divine, *Claude Espence*, in his Comment. in Epist. ad Titum, Opp., tom. i., p. 479, indignantly wrote concerning this book: Prostat et veluti in quæstu pro meretrice sedet palam, &c., that is, "there is a book extant, which like a venal prostitute appears openly before the public here at Paris, and is now for sale, as it long has been, entitled Taxa cameræ seu cancellariæ apostolicæ; from which more crimes can be learned, than from all the writings concerning the vices; and in which license is promised to very many, and absolution offered to all purchasers."—*Schl.*]

(8) [The German princes and states both Catholic and Lutheran, assembled in the diet at Nuremburg, A. D. 1522, complained loudly of the papal indulgences, as exhausting the resources of the country, and subverting piety and good morals; in their Centum Gravamina nationis Germanicæ, No. 4, &c —*Tr.*]

tempt, not only by the wise and the good but likewise by the common people.(9) For as sacred offices were now every where bought and sold, it was difficult for honest and pious men to get possession of any good living in the church, but very easy for the vicious and unprincipled.

§ 11. The immense swarms of monks produced every where great grievances and complaints. Yet this age, which stood midway between light and darkness, would patiently have borne with this indolent throng, if they had only exhibited some show of piety and decorum. But the Benedictines, and the other orders which were allowed to possess lands and fixed revenues, abused their wealth, and rushed headlong into every species of vice, regardless altogether of the rules they professed. The Mendicant orders on the contrary, and especially those who professed to follow the rules of *Dominic* and *Francis*, by their rustic impudence, their ridiculous superstition, their ignorance and cruelty, their rude and brutish conduct, alienated the minds of most people from them. They all had a strong aversion to learning, and were very unfriendly to the proceedings of certain excellent men who laboured to improve the system of education, and who assailed the barbarism of the times, both orally and in their writings. This is evident from what befell *Reuchlin*, *Erasmus*, and others.(10)

§ 12. No order of monks was more powerful and influential, than that of the Dominicans. For they filled the highest offices in the church, they presided every where over the terrible tribunal of the *Inquisition*, and in the courts of all the kings and princes of Europe they had the care of souls, or held the office of *confessors*. Yet about this time they incurred very great odium among all good men, by various things but especially by their base artifices and frauds; (among which, the tragedy at Berne A.D. 1509, stands conspicuous:)(11) likewise by persecuting the learned and

(9) See, besides others, *Cornelius Aurelius Gaudanus*, Apocalypsis seu Visio mirabilis super miserabili statu matris ecclesiæ; in *Casp. Burmann's* Analecta Historica de Hadriano VI., p. 245, &c., Utrecht, 1727, 4to.

(10) [*Reuchlin* or *Capnio*, was the great promoter of Hebrew and Rabbinic learning in Germany. The Dominicans of Cologne, to bring it into disgrace, prompted *John Pfefferkorn*, a converted Jew, to publish a work on the blasphemies contained in the books of the Jews. This induced the emperor *Maximilian*, in the year 1509, to order all Jewish books to be burned; which however *Reuchlin* happily prevented from taking place.—*Erasmus* published the Greek New Testament, as well as many works of the fathers; by which the ignorant monks represented him as sinning against the Holy Ghost.—*Schl.*]

(11) On the notorious imposition of the monks of Bern, see, among many others, *Jo. Henr. Hottinger's* Historia Eccles. Helvet., tom. i., p. 334, &c. [Historia Eccles. Nov, sæcul. xvi., pt. i., p. 334, &c. The narrative there inserted, was drawn up by a Franciscan monk of Bern, in the year 1509. The substance of it is this. A Dominican monk named *Wigand Wirt*, preaching at Frankfort A.D. 1507, so violently assailed the doctrine of the *immaculate conception* of the virgin Mary, (the favourite doctrine of the Franciscans), that he was summoned to Rome to answer for his conduct. His brethren of the Dominican order, in their convention at Wimpfen formed a plan to aid him, and to convince the world that the Franciscan doctrine of the immaculate conception was false. Bern was selected for the scene of their operations. The prior, subprior, preacher, and steward of the Dominican cloister at Bern, undertook to get up miracles and revelations for the occasion. A simple honest rustic, by the name of *John Jetzer*, who had just entered upon his novitiate in the monastery, was selected as their tool. The subprior appeared to him one night, dressed in white, and pretending to be the ghost of a friar who had been a hundred and sixty years in purgatory. He wailed, and entreated of *Jetzer* to afford him aid. *Jetzer* promised to do it, as far as he was able; and the next morning re-

the good, and branding them as heretics; and also by extending their own privileges and honours at the expense of others, and most unjustly oppressing their adversaries.(12) It was these monks especially, who prompted *Leo* X. to the imprudent step of publicly condemning *Martin Luther*.

§ 13. Many of the mendicant monks held the principal chairs in the universities and schools; and this was the chief reason why the light of science and polite learning, which had begun to diffuse itself through most countries of Europe, could not more effectually dispel the clouds of igno-

ported his vision to his superiors. They encouraged him to go on, and to confer freely with the ghost, if he appeared again. A few nights after, the ghost made his appearance, attended by two devils, his tormentors; and thanked *Jetzer* for the relaxation of his sufferings, in consequence of *Jetzer's* prayers, fasting, &c. He also instructed *Jetzer* respecting the views entertained in the other world, concerning the immaculate conception, and the detention of some pontiffs and others in purgatory, for having persecuted the deniers of that doctrine; and promised *Jetzer* that *St. Barbara* should appear to him and give him farther instruction. Accordingly, the subprior assumed a female garb on a succeeding night, and appeared to *Jetzer*. She revealed to him some parts of his secret history, which the preacher his confessor, had drawn from him at his confessions. *Jetzer* was completely duped. *St. Barbara* promised, that the virgin *Mary* should appear to him. She, or the subprior personating her, did so; and assured him, that she was not conceived free from original sin, though she was delivered from it three hours after her birth; that it was a grievous thing to her, to see that erroneous opinion spread abroad. She blamed the Franciscans much, as being the chief cause of this false belief. She also announced the destruction of the city of Bern, because the people did not expel the Franciscans, and cease from receiving a pension from the French king. She appeared repeatedly, gave *Jetzer* much instruction, and promised to impress on him the five wounds of Christ; which she declared were never impressed on *St. Francis*, or any other person. She accordingly seized his right hand, and thrust a nail through it. This so pained him, that he became restive under the operation; and she promised to impress the other wounds without giving him pain. The conspirators now gave him medicated drugs, which stupified him; and then made the other wounds upon him, while senseless. Hitherto the subprior had been the principal actor. But now the preacher undertook to personate *St. Mary*; and *Jetzer* knew his voice, and from this time began to suspect the whole to be an imposition. All attempts to hoodwink him became fruitless; he was completely undeceived. They next endeavoured to bring him to join voluntarily in the plot. He was persuaded to do so. But they imposed upon him such intolerable austerities, and were detected by him in such impious and immoral conduct, that he wished to leave the monastery. They would not let him go; and were so fearful of his betraying their secret, which was now drawing crowds to their monastery and promised them great advantage, that they determined to destroy him by poison. *Jetzer*, by listening at their door, got knowledge of the fact, and was so on his guard, that they could not succeed, though they used a consecrated host as the medium of the poison. He eloped from the monastery, and divulged the whole transaction. The four conspirators were apprehended, tried for blasphemy and profaning holy ordinances, delivered over to the civil power, burned at the stake in 1509, and their ashes cast into the river near Bern.—Such is an outline of the story, which the Franciscan narrator has drawn out to a tedious length, with great minuteness, and not a little esprit du corps.—*Tr.*]

(12) See *Bilib. Pirckheimer's* Epistle to the pontiff *Hadrian* VI., de Dominicanorum flagitiis; in his Opp., p. 372, whence *Dan. Gerdes* copied it, in his introduct. ad Historiam renovati Evangelii, tom. i., Append., p. 170. [This learned and candid civilian and Catholic of Norimberg, who corresponded with all the leading men of Germany, both Catholics and Protestants, a few years before his death, (which was in 1530), wrote a respectful and excellent letter to pope *Adrian* VI., in which he endeavours to acquaint him with the true state of things in Germany. The grand cause of all the commotions there, he supposed to be the *Dominicans*, who by their persecution of *Capnio* and of all literary men, and by their pride and insolence and base conduct, particularly in trumpeting the papal indulgences, alienated almost all the intelligent and honest from the church, and then by their violent measures drove them to open opposition to the pontiffs.—*Tr.*]

rance and stupidity. Most of the teachers of youth, decorated with the splendid titles of *Artistæ*, *Grammatici*, *Physici*, and *Dialectici*, in a most disgusting style, loaded the memories of their pupils with a multitude of barbarous terms and worthless distinctions; and when the pupil could repeat these with volubility, he was regarded as eloquent and erudite. All the philosophers extolled *Aristotle* beyond measure, but no one followed him, indeed none of them understood him. For what they called the philosophy of *Aristotle*, was a confused mass of obscure notions, sentences, and divisions, the import of which not even the chiefs of the school could comprehend. And if among these thorns of scholastic wisdom, there was any thing that had the appearance of fruit, it was crushed and destroyed by the senseless altercations of the different sects, especially the *Scotists* and *Thomists*, the *Realists* and *Nominalists*, from which no university was free.

§ 14. How perversely and ineptly theology was taught in this age, appears from all the books it has transmitted to us, which are remarkable for nothing but their bulk. Of the *Biblical* doctors, or expounders of the precepts of the Bible, only here and there an individual remained. Even in the university of Paris, which was considered as the mother and queen of all the rest, not a man could be found, when *Luther* arose, competent to dispute with him out of the Scriptures.(13) Such as remained of this class, neglected the literal sense of the Scriptures, which they were utterly unable to investigate on account of their ignorance of the sacred languages and of the laws of interpretation, and insipidly wandered after concealed and hidden meanings. Nearly all the theologians were *Positivi* and *Sententiarii;* who deemed it a great achievement both in speculative and practical theology, either to overwhelm the subject with a torrent of quotations from the fathers, or to anatomize it according to the laws of dialectics. And whenever they had occasion to speak of the meaning of any text, they appealed invariably to what was called the *Glossa Ordinaria;* and the phrase *Glossa dicit*, was as common and decisive in their lips, as anciently the phrase *ipse dixit*, in the Pythagorean school.

§ 15. These doctors, however, disputed among themselves with sufficient freedom on various points of doctrine, and even upon those which were considered essential to salvation. For a great many points of doctrine had not yet been determined by the authority of the church, or as the phrase was by the holy see; and the pontiffs were not accustomed, unless there was some special reason, to make enactments that would restrain liberty of opinion on subjects not connected either with the sovereignty of the holy see or the privileges and emoluments of the clergy. Hence many persons of great eminence might be named, who safely advanced the same opinions and not without applause, before *Luther's* day, which were afterwards charged upon him as a crime. And doubtless, *Luther* might have enjoyed the same liberty with them, if he had not attacked the system of Roman finance, the wealth of the bishops, the supremacy of the pontiffs, and the reputation of the Dominican order.

(13) [This was not strange. Many of the doctors of theology in those times, had never read the Bible. *Carolostadt* expressly tells us, this was the case with himself. Whenever one freely read the Bible, he was cried out against, as one making innovations, a heretic, and as exposing Christianity to great danger by making the New Testament known. Many of the monks regarded the Bible as a book which abounded in numerous errors.—*Von Ein.*]

§ 16. The public worship of God consisted almost wholly in a round of ceremonies; and those for the most part vain and useless, being calculated not to affect the heart but to dazzle the eye. Those who delivered sermons, (which many were not able to do), filled the ears of the people with pretended miracles, ridiculous fables, wretched quibbles, and similar trash, thrown together without judgment.(14) There are still extant many examples of such discourses, which no good man can read without indignation. If among these declaimers there were some inclined to be more grave, for them certain commonplace arguments were prepared and made out, on which they vociferated on almost all occasions, by the hour; such for instance, as the authority of the holy mother church, and the obedience due to it; the influence of the saints with God, and their virtues and merits; the dignity, glory, and kindness of the virgin *Mary;* the efficacy of relics; the enriching of the churches and monasteries; the necessity of what they called good works in order to salvation; the intolerable flames of *purgatory;* and the utility of indulgences. To preach to the people nothing but Christ Jesus our Saviour and his merits, and that pure love of God and men which springs from faith, would have added little to the treasures and emoluments of good mother church.

§ 17. From these causes there was, among all classes and ranks in every country, an amazing ignorance on religious subjects; and no less superstition, united with gross corruption of morals. Those who presided over the ceremonies willingly tolerated these evils, and indeed encouraged them in various ways, rather than strove to stifle them, well knowing that their own interests were depending on them. Nor did most of them think it advisable to oppose strenuously the corruption of morals; for they well knew that if the crimes and sins of the people were diminished, the sale of *indulgences* would also decrease, and they would of course derive much less revenue from *expiations* and other similar sources.(15)

(14) [The Easter sermons in particular, are proof of this; in which the preachers were emulous to provoke laughter among the audience, by repeating ludicrous stories, low jests, and whimsical incidents. This was called emphatically, *Easter laughter;* and it still has its admirers in some portions of the Catholic church. *John Œcolampadius* in the year 1518, published at Basil, a tract of 32 pages 4to, entitled: De risu paschali, Œcolampadii ad W. Capitonem theologum epistola. See *J. C. Füsslin's* Beyträge zur Kirchen-Reformationsgesch. des Sweitzerlandes, vol. v, p. 447, &c.—*Schl.*]

(15) [*Schlegel* here inserts the following history of popish indulgences, according to the views of *Dr. Mosheim;* derived undoubtedly from his public lectures, which *Schlegel* himself had heard, and has frequently referred to.—*Tr.* The origin of indulgences must be sought in the earliest history of the church. In the first centuries of the Christian church, such Christians as were excluded from the communion, on account of their relapses in times of persecution, or on account of other heinous sins, had to seek a restoration to fellowship by a public penance, in which they entreated the brethren to forgive their offence, standing before the door of the church clothed in the garb of mourning. This ecclesiastical punishment, which was regarded as a sort of *satisfaction* made to the community, and was called by that name, and which prevented much irregularity among Christians, was afterwards moderated, and sometimes remitted, in the case of infirm persons; and this remission was called *indulgence, indulgentia.* Originally therefore, indulgences were merely the remission of ecclesiastical punishments, imposed on the lapsed and other gross offenders. When persecutions ceased, and the principal ground for this ecclesiastical regulation no longer existed, these punishments might have been laid aside. [Not so: for relapsing into idolatry, was only one among the many offences, for which penance was imposed; and as persecutions ceased and the church became rich and corrupt, other sins were multiplied; so that the ground for inflicting church censures rather increased, than diminished.—*Tr.*] They continued;

§ 18. Yet the more ruinous the evils prevalent throughout the church, the more earnestly was a reformation longed for, by all who were governed either by good sense and solid learning or by a regard to piety. Nor was the number of these in the whole Latin world, by any means small. The majority of them did not indeed wish to see the constitution and organiza-

and the doctrine gradually grew up, that Christ had atoned for the *eternal* punishment of sin, but not for its temporary punishment. The temporary punishment they divided into that of the present life, and that of the future life or of purgatory. It was held, that every man who would attain salvation, must suffer the temporary punishment of his sins, either in the present world, or in the flames of purgatory; and that the confessor to whom a man confessed his sins, had the power to adjudge and impose this temporary punishment. The punishment thus imposed consisted of fasting, pilgrimages, flagellation, &c. But among the persons liable to such punishments, were frequently persons of distinction and wealth. And for these, the principle of admitting *substitutes* was introduced. And there were monks, who for compensation paid them, would endure these punishments in behalf of the rich. But as every man could not avail himself of this relief, they at last commuted that penance into a pious mulct, pia mulcta. Whoever, for instance, was bound to whip himself for several weeks, might pay to the church or to the monastery, a certain sum of money, or give it a piece of land, and then be released from the penance. Thus *Pepin* of France, having, with the consent of the pope, dethroned the lawful monarch of that country, gave to the church the patrimony of St. Peter. As the popes perceived that something might be gained in this way, they assumed wholly to themselves the right of commuting canonical penances for pecuniary satisfactions, which every bishop had before exercised in his own diocese. At first they released only from the punishments of sin in the present world; but in the fourteenth century, they extended this release also to the punishments of purgatory. Jesus, they said, has not removed all the punishments of sin. Those which he has not removed, are either the punishments of this world, that is, the penances which confessors enjoin, or the punishments of the future world, that is, those of purgatory. An indulgence frees a person from both these. The first, the pope remits by his papal power as sovereign lord of the church; just as the sovereign of a country can commute the corporeal punishment, which the inferior judges decree, into pecuniary mulcts. The last, he remits, (as *Benedict* XIV. says in his bull for the jubilee), jure suffragii; that is, by his prevalent intercession with God, who can deny nothing to his vicegerent. Yet this release from the punishments of sin, cannot be bestowed gratis. There must be an equivalent, that is, some money, which is given to the pope for religious uses. Princes indeed never release a man from corporeal punishment, unless he petitions for it. But the vicegerent of Christ is more gracious than other judges, and causes his indulgences to be freely offered to the whole church, and to be proclaimed aloud throughout the Christian world. These principles carried into operation drew immense sums of money to Rome. When such indulgences were to be published, the disposal of them was commonly farmed out. For the papal court could not always wait to have the money collected and conveyed from every country of Europe. And there were rich merchants at Genoa, Milan, Venice, and Augsburg, who purchased the indulgences for a particular province, and paid to the papal chancery handsome sums for them. Thus both parties were benefited. The chancery came at once into possession of large sums of money; and the farmers did not fail of a good bargain. They were careful to employ skilful hawkers of the indulgences, persons whose boldness and impudence bore due proportion to the eloquence with which they imposed upon the simple people. Yet that this species of traffic might have a religious aspect, the pope appointed the archbishops of the several provinces to be his commissaries, who in his name published, that indulgences were to be sold, and generally selected the persons to hawk them, and for this service shared the profits with the merchants who farmed them. These papal hawkers enjoyed great privileges, and however odious to the civil authorities, they were not to be molested. Complaints indeed were made against these contributions, levied by the popes upon all Christian Europe. Kings and princes, clergy and laity, bishops, monasteries, and confessors, all felt themselves aggrieved by them; the former, that their countries were impoverished, under the pretext of crusades that were never undertaken, and of wars against heretics and Turks; and the latter, that their letters of indulgence were rendered inefficient, and the people released from ecclesiastical discipline. But at Rome, all were deaf to these complaints; and it was not till the revolution produced by Luther, that unhappy Europe obtained the desired relief.—*Schl.*]

tion of the church altered, nor the doctrines which had become sacred by long admission rejected, nor the rites and ceremonies abrogated; but only, to have some bounds set to the power of the pontiffs, the corrupt morals and the impositions of the clergy corrected, the ignorance and errors of the people dispelled, and the burdens imposed on the people under colour of religion removed. But as none of these reforms could be effected, without first extirpating various absurd and impious opinions which gave birth to the evils, or without purging the existing religion from its corruptions, all those may be considered as implicitly demanding a reformation of *religion*, who are represented as calling for a reformation of the *church* both *in its head and in its members*.

§ 19. What little of real piety still remained, existed as it were under the patronage of those called *Mystics*. For this class of persons, both by their tongues and by their pens, avoiding all scholastic disputations, and demonstrating the vanity of mere external worship, exhorted men to strive only to obtain holiness of heart and communion with God. And hence they were loved and respected, by most of those who seriously and earnestly sought for salvation. Yet as all of them associated the vulgar errors and superstitions with their precepts of piety, and many of them were led into strange opinions by their excessive love of contemplation, and were but little removed from fanatical delirium, more powerful auxiliaries than they, were necessary to the subjugation of the inveterate prejudices.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE COMMENCEMENT AND PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION, TILL THE PRESENTMENT OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION; [OR FROM A.D. 1517–1530.]

§ 1. The beginning of the Reformation.—§ 2. Luther.—§ 3. John Tetzel preaches Indulgences, in 1517.—§ 4. State of the Question between these two Persons.—§ 5. The Opposers of the former, and Patrons of the latter.—§ 6. Conference of Luther with Cajetan at Augsburg.—§ 7. The Issue of it.—§ 8. Proceedings of Miltitz. All Plans for Peace frustrated.—§ 9. The Discussions at Leipsic. Eckius. Carolostadt.—§ 10. Philip Melancthon.—§ 11. Beginning of the Reformation in Switzerland.—§ 12. Luther is Excommunicated by the Pope, in 1520.—§ 13. He withdraws from the Communion of the Romish Church.—§ 14. The Rise of the Lutheran Church.—§ 15. The Diet of Worms, in 1521.—§ 16. The Events of it. Luther is Proscribed.—§ 17. His Pursuits, after leaving the Castle of Wartburg.—§ 18. Hadrian VI. The Diet of Nuremberg in 1522.—§ 19. Clement VII. A.D. 1524.—§ 20. Carolostadt. Zwingle.—§ 21. War of the Peasants in 1525.—§ 22. Death of Frederic the Wise. John his Successor.—§ 23. The Diet of Spire in 1526.—§ 24. Subsequent Progress of the Reformation.—§ 25. The Diet of Spire in 1529. The Protestants.—§ 26. Their Alliance.—§ 27. The Conference at Marpurg, in 1529.—§ 28. The Diet to be assembled at Augsburg.—§ 29. The State of the Reformation in Sweden, about the year 1530.—§ 30. Reformation effected in Denmark by Christiern.—§ 31. It was completed by Frederic and by Christian III.—§ 32. A Discrimination to be made, in regard to the Swedish and Danish Reformation.—§ 33. The Reformation in France.—§ 34. Reformation in other Countries in Europe.

§ 1. While the Roman pontiffs supposed all was safe and tranquil, and the pious and good were every where despairing of the much-longed-for

reformation of the church, unexpectedly a little obscure monk of Saxony a province in Germany, *Martin Luther* of Eisleben, born of reputable but humble parentage, of the order of the Augustinian Eremites which was one of the four mendicant orders, and a professor of theology in the university of Wittemberg, which Frederic the Wise elector of Saxony had established a few years before, with astonishing intrepidity opposed himself alone to the whole Romish power. It was in the year 1517, when *Leo* X. was at the head of the church; *Maximilian* I. of Austria, governed the German Roman empire; and *Frederic*, for his great wisdom surnamed the Wise, ruled over Saxony. Many applauded the courage and heroism of this new opposer; but almost no one anticipated his success. For it was not to be expected, that this light-armed warrior could harm a *Hercules*, whom so many heroes had assailed in vain.

§ 2. That *Luther* was possessed of extraordinary talents, uncommon genius, a copious memory, astonishing industry and perseverance, superior eloquence, a greatness of soul that rose above all human weaknesses, and consummate erudition for the age in which he lived, even those among his enemies who possess some candour, do not deny. In the philosophy then taught in the schools, he was as well versed as he was in theology; and he taught both, with great applause, in the university of Wittemberg. In the former, he followed the principles of the *Nominalists*, which were embraced by his order, that of the Augustinians; in the latter, he was a follower for the most part of *St. Augustine*. But he had long preferred the holy scriptures and sound reason, before any human authorities or opinions. No wise man indeed will pronounce him entirely faultless; yet if we except the imperfections of the times in which he lived and of the religion in which he was trained, we shall find little to censure in the man.(16)

(16) All the writers who have given the history of *Luther's* life and achievements, are enumerated by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, in his Centifolium Lutheranum, of which the first volume appeared at Hamburg in 1728, and the second volume, in 1730, 8vo. [*Melancthon*, de Vita Lutheri, ed. Heumann, Gotting., 1741, 4to. *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit. der Reformation, vol. i., p 106, &c. *J.* and *I. Milner's* Church History, cent. xvi. *Alex. Bower's* Life of Luther, Edinb., 1813, and numerous others; among which the following are particularly recommended by *Schlegel.—Tr. J. G. Walch's* Ausfürliche Nachricht Von D. Mart. Luther, prefixed to the 24th vol. of his edition of Luther's works, p. 1-875, which exceeds all others in fulness and learned fidelity. The earlier work of *F. S. Keil*, merkwürdige Lebensumstände D. Mart. Luther's, Leipsic, 1764, 4 vols., contains much that is good, with some things that are censurable. Also, from its historical connexion, *C. W. F. Walch's* Gesch. der Frau Catharina Von Bora, Martin Luther's Ehegattin, 2 vols., Gotting., 1753-54, 8vo, and Prof. *Schroeckh's* Life of Luther, in his Abbildungen der Gelehrten. From these writings we adduce these principal circumstances.—*Luther's* father was a miner of Mansfield. He was born at Eisleben, A D. 1483. After attending the schools of Magdeburg and Eisenach, he studied scholastic philosophy and jurisprudence at Erfurt, and at the same time read the ancient Latin authors. But his intimate friend being killed, and himself completely stunned, by a clap of thunder, he joined himself, much against the will of his father, to one of the most rigid orders of mendicants, that of the Augustinian Eremites. In this situation he so conducted himself, that his superiors were well satisfied with his industry, good temper, and abilities. In the year 1508, *John von Staupitz*, his vicar-general, sent him from Erfurt to Wittemberg, contrary to his inclinations, to be professor of philosophy. He now applied himself more to biblical theology, discovered the defects of the scholastic philosophy, and began to reject human authorities in matters of religion; and in these views, his baccalaureate in theolgy, which he took in the year 1509, confirmed him still more. A journey to Rome, which he undertook in the year 1510 on the business of his order, procured him knowledge and experience, which were afterwards of great use to him. After his return, he took in the year 1512, his degree of doctor in divinity; and

§ 3. The first occasion for publishing the truths he had discovered, was presented to this great man, by *John Tetzel*, a Dominican monk void of shame, whom *Albert* the archbishop of Mentz and Magdeburg, had hired on account of his impudence, to solicit the Germans, in the name of the Roman pontiff *Leo* X., to expiate with money their own sins and those of their friends, and future sins as well as past ones, or in other words, *to preach*

he now applied himself diligently to the study of the Greek and Hebrew languages. All these pursuits were preparations for that great work, which divine Providence intended to accomplish by him; and they procured him a degree of learning, that was great for those times. He was not inexpert in philosophy, and he understood the Bible, better than any other teacher in the Catholic church; he had critically read the writings of the fathers; and had studied, among the modern writers, especially *William Occam* and *John Gerson*, together with the Mystics of the two preceding centuries, and particularly *John Tauler*; and from the two former, (*Occam* and *Gerson*), he learned to view the papal authority, differently from the mass of people; and from the latter, (the Mystics), he learned many practical truths relating to the religion of the heart, which were not to be found in the ordinary books of devotion and piety. Of church history he had so much knowledge, as was necessary for combating the prevalent errors, and for restoring the primitive religion of Christians. In the Belles Lettres also, he was not a novice. He wrote the German language with greater purity, elegance, and force, than any other author of that age; and his translation of the Bible and his hymns still exhibit proof, how correctly, nervously, and clearly, he could express himself in his native tongue. He possessed a natural, strong, and moving eloquence. These acquisitions and talents resided in a mind of uncommon ardour, and of heroic virtue in action; and he applied them to objects of the greatest utility, both to mankind at large, and to the individual members of society. He saw religion to be disfigured with the most pernicious errors, and reason and conscience to be under intolerable bondage. He chased away these errors, brought true religion and sound reason again into repute, rescued virtue from slavish subjection to human authorities, and made it obedient to nobler motives, vindicated the rights of man against the subverters of them, furnished the state with useful citizens by removing obstructions to marriage, and gave to the thrones of princes their original power and security. By what means he gradually effected all this good for mankind, will appear in the course of this history. It is true, the man who performed these heroic deeds for Europe, had his imperfections. For heroes are but men. But his faults were not the fruits of a corrupt heart, but of a warm, sanguine, choleric temperament, and the effects of his education and of the times in which he lived. He answered his opposers, even when they were kings and princes, with too great acrimony, with passion, and often with personal abuse. He acknowledged this as a fault, and commended *Melancthon* and *Brentius*, who exhibited more mildness in their conversation and writings. But it was his zeal for the truth that enkindled his passions: and perhaps they were necessary in those times; perhaps also they were the consequence of his monastic life, in which he had no occasion to learn worldly courtesy. And, were not the harsh and passionate terms which he used towards his opposers, the controversial language of his age? We do not say this, to justify Luther: he was a man, and he had human weaknesses; but he was clearly one of the best men, known in that century. This is manifest, among other proofs, from his writings: the most important of which, we shall here enumerate. Theses de indulgentiis, or, Disputatio pro declaratione virtutis indulgentiarum, 1517. A sermon on indulgences and grace, 1518. Resolutiones Thesium de indulgentiis. Among his exegetical writings, his Commentary on the epistle to the Galatians, and that on Genesis, are the most important. In his own estimation, his best work was his *Postilles*, which were published in 1527. His essays de libertate Christiana, de captivitate Babylonica, and, de votis monasticis, are very polemic; as also his book against *Erasmus*, de servo arbitrio, in which he closely follows *Augustine* in the doctrine concerning grace, while the earliest among the Reformed defended universal grace. His translation of the Bible, which was first published by parcels, and appeared entire, for the first time in 1534; his larger and smaller Catechisms; the seventeen Articles of Schwabach; the Articles of Schmalkald; and his Letters, are very noticeable. The best edition of his writings, is that of Halle, 1737–53, in twenty-four volumes, 4to, to which the immortal counsellor *Walch* has imparted the greatest possible perfection.—*Schl.*]

indulgences.(17) This fraudulent declaimer conducted the business, not only in dereliction of all modesty and decency, but in a manner that impiously detracted from the merits of Jesus Christ. Hence *Luther*, moved with just indignation, publicly exposed at Wittemberg, on the first day of October A.D. 1517, ninety-five propositions; in which he chastised the madness of these indulgence-sellers generally, and not obscurely censured the pontiff himself, for suffering the people to be thus diverted from looking to Christ. This was the beginning of that great war, which extinguished no small portion of the pontifical grandeur.(18)

(17) The writers who give account of *Tetzel* and of his base methods of deluding the multitude, are enumerated by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius* in his Centifolium Lutheranum, pt. i., p. 47, and pt. ii., p. 530. What is said of this vile man, by *Jac. Echard* and *Jac. Quetif*, in their Scriptores ordinis Prædicatorum, tom. ii., p. 40, betrays immoderate and ignoble partiality.

(18) [The pope offered as a pretext for this new spiritual tax, the completion of the church of St. Peter, which had been commenced by *Julius* II., and he appointed for his first commissary in Germany, *Albert* archbishop of Mentz and Magdeburg and margrave of Brandenburg, who from the expensiveness of his court, had not yet paid the fees for his pall, and was to pay them out of his share of the profits of these indulgences. The second commissary was *Jo. Angelus Arcimbald.* In Saxony, *John Tetzel*, who had before been a successful preacher of papal indulgences, was appointed to this service. He was a profligate wretch, who had once fallen into the hands of the Inquisition in consequence of his adulteries, and whom the elector of Saxony rescued by his intercession. He now cried up his merchandise, in a manner so offensive, so contrary to all Christian principles, and so acceptably to the inconsiderate, that all upright men were disgusted with him; yet they dared to sigh over this unclerical traffic only in private. He pursued it as far north as Zerbst and Jüterbock, and selected the annual fairs for its prosecution. He claimed to have power to absolve, not only from all church censures, but likewise from all sins, transgressions, and enormities, however horrid they might be, and even from those of which the pope only can take cognizance. He released from all the punishments of purgatory, gave permission to come to the sacraments, and promised to those who purchased his indulgences, that the gates of hell should be closed and the gates of paradise and of bliss open to them. See *Herm. von der Hardt*, Hist. litter. Reformat., pt iv., § 6, 14, &c. Some Wittembergers, who had purchased his wares, came to *Luther* as he was sitting in the confessional of his cloister, and acknowledged to him very gross sins. And when he laid upon them heavy ecclesiastical penances, they produced *Tetzel's* letters of indulgence, and demanded absolution. But he declined giving them absolution, unless they submitted to the penance, and thus gave some evidence of repentance and amendment; and he declared, that he put no value upon their letters of indulgence. These sentiments he also published in a discourse from the pulpit; and he complained to the archbishop of Mentz, and to some of the bishops, of this shameful abuse of indulgences; and published his *theses* or propositions, against *Tetzel*; in which he did not indeed discard all use of indulgences, but only maintained that they were merely a release by the pope from the canonical penances for sin, as established by ecclesiastical law, and did not extend to the punishments which God inflicts; that forgiveness of sins was to be had only from God, through real repentance and sorrow, and that God requires no penance or satisfaction therefor. The enemies of the reformation tell us, that *Luther* was actuated by passion, and that envy between the Dominicans and the Augustinians was the moving cause of *Luther's* enterprise. They say, the Augustinians had previously been employed to preach indulgences, but now the Dominicans were appointed to this lucrative office; and that *Luther* took up his pen against *Tetzel*, by order of *John von Staupitz*, [provincial of the order], who was dissatisfied because his order was neglected on this occasion. The author of this fable was *John Cochlæus*; (in his Historia de actis et scriptis Mart. Lutheri, p. 3, 4, Paris, 1665, 8vo), and from this raving enemy of Luther, it has been copied by some French and English writers, and from them by a few German writers of this age. But the evidence of this hypothesis, is still wanting. It is still unproved, that the Augustinians ever had the exclusive right of preaching indulgences. (See *Fred. Will. Kraft*, de Luthero contra indulgentiarum nundinatores haudquaquam per invidiam disputante, Gotting., 1749, 4to.) *Luther* was far too openhearted not to let something of this envy appear in his

§ 4. This first controversy between *Luther* and *Tetzel*, was in itself of no great importance, and might have been easily settled, if *Leo* X. had possessed either the ability or the disposition to treat it prudently. For it was the private contest of two monks, respecting the limits of the power of the Roman pontiffs in remitting the punishment of sins. *Luther* acknowledged that the pontiff could remit the *human* punishments for sin, or those appointed by the church or the pontiffs; but denied his power to absolve from the *divine* punishments, either of the present or the future world; and maintained, that these divine punishments must be removed, either by the merits of Jesus Christ, or by voluntary penance endured by the sinner. *Tetzel* on the contrary, asserted that the pontiff could release also from *divine* punishments, and from those of the future as well as of the present life. This subject had in preceding times been often discussed, and the pontiffs had passed no decrees about it. But the present dispute being at first neglected, and then treated unwisely, gradually increased, till from small beginnings it involved consequences of the highest importance.

§ 5. *Luther* was applauded by the best part of Germany, who had long borne very impatiently the various artifices of the pontiffs for raising money, and the impudence and impositions of the pontifical tax-gatherers. But the sycophants of the pontiffs cried out; and none more loudly than the Dominicans, who, in the manner of all monks, considered their whole order as injured by *Luther*, in the person of *Tetzel*. In the first place, *Tetzel* himself forthwith attacked *Luther*, in two disputes at the university of Frankfort on the Oder, upon occasion of his taking his degree of doctor in theology. The following year, A.D. 1518, two celebrated Dominicans, the one an Italian named *Sylvester Prierias* the general of his order at Rome, and the other a German, *James Hoogstrat* of Cologne, assailed him with great fury. They were followed by a third adversary, a great friend of the Dominicans, *John Eckius* a theologian of Ingolstadt. To these adversaries *Luther* replied with spirit, and at the same time he addressed very modest letters to the Roman pontiff himself and to some of the bishops; to whom he endeavoured to evince the justice of his cause, and promised to change his views and correct his opinions, if they could be shown to be erroneous.(19)

writings, if he really was urged on to action by it; and his enemies were far too sharp-sighted, if they had even the slightest suspicion of it, not to have reproached him with it in his lifetime. Yet not one of them did this. For what *Cochlæus* has said on this subject, did not appear till after *Luther's* death. (See a long and well-written note on this subject, in *Maclaine's* translation of *Mosheim*, on this paragraph; and which *Villers* has subjoined, as an Appendix, to his Essay on the reformation by *Luther*. *Pallavicini*, in his Historia concilii Trident., pt. i., lib i., c 3, § 6, &c. *Graveson*, Historia Eccles., saecul. xvi., p. 26, and other Catholics, though enemies of the reformation, expressly deny and confute this charge against Luther.—*Tr.*) Others tell us, with as little evidence of truth, that *Luther* was prompted to take this step by the court of Saxony; which had a design to draw into its own coffers the religious property situated in Saxony: an objection, which the whole series of subsequent events will refute. *Luther* at first, had no thought of overthrowing the papal hierarchy; and *Frederic* the Wise, who was opposed to all innovations in ecclesiastical or religious matters, would evidently be one of the last persons to form such a plan.—*Schl*]

(19) [*Luther* attended the general convention of the Augustinians at Heidelberg, in the year 1518; and in a discussion there, he defended his *Paradoxes*, (so he entitled his propositions), with such energy and applause, that the seeds of evangelical truth took deep root in that part of the country. See *Martin Bucer's* Relatio de disputatione Heidelbergensi, in *Dan. Gerdes*, Append ad tom. i. Historiae Evangelii renovati, No. 18, p.

§ 6. *Leo* X. at first disregarded this controversy; but being informed by the emperor *Maximilian* I. that it was an affair of no little consequence, and that Germany was taking sides in regard to it, he summoned *Luther* to appear at Rome and take his trial.(20) Against this mandate of the pontiff, *Frederic* the Wise elector of Saxony interposed, and requested that *Luther's* cause might be tried in Germany, according to the ecclesiastical laws of the country. The pontiff yielded to the wishes of *Frederic;* and ordered *Luther* to appear before his legate, cardinal *Thomas Cajetan,* [*Thomas de Vio* of *Gæta*], then at the diet of Augsburg, and there defend his doctrines and conduct. The Romish court here exhibited an example of the greatest indiscretion that appeared in the whole transaction. For *Cajetan* being a Dominican, and of course the enemy of *Luther,* and an associate of *Tetzel,* a more unfit person could not have been named to sit as judge and arbiter of the cause.

§ 7. *Luther* repaired to Augsburg in the month of October A.D. 1518, and had three interviews with *Cajetan* the pontifical legate.(21) But if *Luther* had been disposed to yield, this Dominican was not the person to bring a high-spirited man to accomplish such a purpose. For he treated him imperiously, and peremptorily required him humbly to confess his errors, without being convinced of them by argument, and to submit his judgment to that of the pontiff.(22) And as *Luther* could not bring himself to do

175, &c. After his return from Heidelberg, he wrote to the pope in very submissive terms. See his works, ed. Halle, vol. xv., p. 496. He also wrote to *Jerome Scultetus,* bishop of Brandenburg, to whose diocese Wittemberg belonged; and likewise to *Staupitz;* using in both instances very modest language.—*Schl.*]

(20) [Here is undoubtedly a slip of the memory. Before *Maximilian's* letter arrived at Rome, *Leo* had cited *Luther* to appear within 60 days, at Rome, and take his trial before *Jerome* bishop of Ascoli, and his enemy *Sylvester Prierias,* as his judges. See *Seckendorf's* Historia Lutheranismi, p. 41, and *Luther's* Works, vol. xv., p. 527, &c. *Maximilian* was himself friendly to *Luther;* but was now pushed on by some of his courtiers.—*Schl.*]

(21) Of *Cajetan* a full account is given by *Jac. Quetif* and *Jac Echard,* in their Scriptores ordin. Prædicator., tom. ii., p. 14, &c. [He was born, A.D. 1469, at *Gæta,* in Latin *Cajeta,* (whence his surname *Cajetanus*), in the territory of Naples; at the age of 29, he wrote a book to prove that a general council could not be called without the authority of a pope; and was rewarded with the bishopric of Gæta, and then with the archbishopric of Pisa; and in 1515, with a cardinal's hat. In 1522, he was papal legate to Hungary; and died A.D. 1534, aged 65. Cajetan was fond of study, and wrote much on the Aristotelian philosophy, scholastic theology, and in the latter years of his life, extensive commentaries on the scriptures.—*Tr.*]

(22) *Cajetan's* proceedings with *Luther* were dissatisfactory even to the court of Rome. See *Paul Sarpi's* Historia concilii Trident., lib. i., p. 22. Yet *Echard* apologizes for Cajetan, in his Scriptores ordin. Prædicator., tom. ii., p. 15; but I think, not very wisely and solidly. The court of Rome however erred in this matter, as much as *Cajetan.* For it might have been easily foreseen, that a Dominican would not have treated Luther with moderation. [*Cajetan* was one of the most learned men of his church; but he was a scholastic divine, and undertook to confute *Luther* by the canon law and the authority of *Lombard.* The electoral court of Saxony proceeded very circumspectly in this affair. *Luther* was not only furnished with a safe conduct, but was attended by two counsellors, who supported him with their legal assistance. The cardinal required *Luther* to revoke, in particular, two errors in his Theses; namely, that there was not any treasury of the merits of saints at Rome, from which the pope could dispense portions to those that obtained indulgences from him; and that, without faith, no forgiveness of sin could be obtained from God. *Luther* would admit of none but scripture proofs; and as the cardinal, who was no biblical scholar, could not produce such proofs, *Luther* held fast his opinions; and when the cardinal began to be restless and to threaten ecclesiastical censures, *Luther* appealed à Pontifice male informato ad melius informandum:—a legal step, which was no wise harsh, and one which is resorted to at the

this, the result of the discussion was, that *Luther* previously to his departure from Augsburg, in perfect consistency with the dignity of the pontiff, appealed from the pontiff ill-informed, to the same when better informed.(23) Soon after, on the 9th of November, *Leo* X. published a special edict, requiring all his subjects to believe, that he had power to forgive sins. On learning this, *Luther* perceiving that he had nothing to expect from Rome, appealed at Wittemburg November 28, from the pontiff to a future council of the whole church.

§ 8. The Romish court seemed now to be sensible of its error in appointing *Cajetan*. It therefore about the same time, appointed another legate, who was not a party in the case, and who possessed more knowledge of human nature, to attempt to reconcile *Luther* to the pontiff. This was *Charles von Miltitz*, a Saxon knight who belonged to the court of *Leo* X., a discreet and sagacious man. The pontiff sent him into Saxony to present to the electoral prince *Frederic* the consecrated golden rose, which the pontiffs sometimes gave to distinguished men whom they were disposed to honour; and also to negotiate with *Luther* for terminating his contest with *Tetzel*, or rather with the pontiff himself. And he managed the business, not without some success. For immediately, in his first interview with *Luther* at Altenburg in the month of January, 1519, he prevailed on him to write a very submissive letter to *Leo* X., dated March 3d, in which he promised to be silent, provided his enemies would also be silent. *Miltitz* had other discussions with Luther in October of this year, in the castle of Liebenwerda; and in the following year, 1520, October 12th, at Lichtenberg.(24) Nor was the prospect utterly hopeless, that these threatening commotions might be stilled.(25) But the insolence of *Luther's* foes, and the haughty indiscretion of the court of Rome, soon afterwards dissipated all these prospects of peace.

§ 9. The incident which caused the failure of *Miltitz's* embassy, was a conference or dispute at Leipsic, in the year 1519, from the 27th of June to the 15th of July. *John Eckius*, the celebrated papal theologian, disagreed with *Andrew Carolostadt* a friend and colleague of *Luther*, in regard to *free will*. He therefore challenged *Carolostadt*, according to the custom of the age, to a personal dispute, to be held at Leipsic; and also invited *Luther*, against whom he had before wielded the pen of controversy. For the martial spirit of our ancestors had made its way into the schools, and among the learned; and heated dissentients on points of religion or literature were accustomed to challenge one another to such single combats, like knights and warriors. These literary combats were usually held in some

present day, by persons who do not question the infallibility of the pope. By this appeal, he recognised the jurisdiction of the pope, and at the same time secured this advantage, that the cardinal as a delegated judge, had no longer jurisdiction of the case.—*Schl.*]

(23) See *Christ. Fred. Bœrner's* Diss. de colloquio Lutheri cum Cajetano. Lips., 1722, 4to; also among his Dissertations collected in one volume; and *Val. Ern. Loescher's* Acta et documenta Reformat., tom. iii., c. xi., p. 435, &c., and *Jo. Geo. Walch's* Nachricht von Luthero, in the Works of Luther, vol. xxiv., p. 409, &c.

(24) The documents relating to the embassy of *Miltitz*, were first published by *Ern. Salom. Cyprian*, in his Additiones ad *Wilh. Ern. Tenzelii* Historiam Reform., tom. i. et ii. They are also contained in *Val. Ern. Loescher's* Acta Reformat., tom. ii., c. xvi., and tom. iii., c. ii., &c.

(25) *Leo* X. himself wrote a very kind letter to *Luther*, in the year 1519; which memorable document was published by *Loescher*, in his Unschuldigen Nachrichten, 1742, p. 133. It appears clearly from this epistle, that no doubt of a final reconciliation was entertained at Rome.

distinguished university, and the rector of the university with the masters, were the arbiters of the contest and adjudged the victory. *Carolostadt* consented to the proposed contest, and on the day appointed he appeared on the arena, attended by *Luther*. After *Carolostadt* had disputed warmly for many days with *Eckius*, before a large and splendid assembly in the castle of Pleissenburg, on the powers of free will; *Luther* engaged with the same antagonist, in a contest respecting the supremacy and authority of the Roman pontiff.(26) But the disputants accomplished nothing; nor would *Hoffmann* the rector of the university of Leipsic, take upon him to say, which party was victorious; but the decision of the cause was referred to the universities of Paris and Erfurth.(27) *Eckius* however carried away from this contest feelings entirely hostile to *Luther*, and to the great detriment of the pontiff and the Romish church, was resolved on ruining him.

§ 10. Among the witnesses and spectators of this dispute, was *Philip Melancthon*, professor of Greek at Wittemberg; who had hitherto taken no part in the controversies, and from the mildness of his temper and his love of elegant literature was averse from such disputes, yet he was friendly to *Luther* and to his efforts for rescuing the science of theology from the subtilties of the Scholastics.(28) As he was doubtless one of those who went home from this discussion, more convinced of the justice of *Luther's* cause, and as he afterwards became, as it were, the second reformer next to *Luther*, it is proper here to give some brief account of his talents and virtues. All know, and even his enemies confess, that few men of any age can be compared with him, either for learning and knowledge of both human and divine things, or for richness, suavity, and facility of genius, or

(26) [*Eck* (or *Eckius*) was a great talker, and one of the most ready disputants of his times. In one of his theses proposed for discussion, he had asserted that the pope was, by divine right, universal bishop of the whole church; and that he was in possession of his ghostly power before the times of *Constantine* the Great. In this disputation, *Luther* maintained the contrary, from passages of Scripture, from the testimony of the fathers and from church history, and even from the decrees of the council of Nice. And when from the subject of the pope they came to that of indulgences, *Luther* denied their absolute necessity; and so of purgatory, he acknowledged indeed that he believed in it, but said he could find no authority for it in the Scriptures, or in the fathers. In fact, it was in the year 1530, that *Luther* first pronounced purgatory to be a fable. The dispute with *Carolostadt*, related to freedom in the theological sense, or to the natural power of man to do the will of God. *Carolostadt* maintained, that since the fall, the natural freedom of man is not strong enough to move him to that which is morally good. *Eck* on the contrary, asserted that the free will of man produces good works, and not merely the grace of God; or that our natural freedom co-operates with divine grace in the production of good works, and that it depends on man's free power, whether he will give place to the operations of grace or will resist them. It thus appears, that *Carolostadt* defended the doctrine of *Augustine* in regard to divine grace. *Eck* claimed to himself the victory; and he gave a very unjust account of this dispute; which occasioned many controversial pamphlets to be published. The chief advantage he gained, was, that he drew from *Luther* assertions which might hasten his condemnation at Rome: assertions, which a man of more worldly cunning than *Luther*, would have kept concealed a long time. But still he lost much of his popularity by this discussion; and on the other hand, the truth gained more adherents, and *Luther's* zeal became more animated.—*Schl.*]

(27) A very full account of this dispute at Leipsic, is in *Val. Ern. Lœscher's* Acta et documenta Reformat., tom. iii., c. vii., p. 203. [The English reader will find a neat summary of the dispute in *Bower's* Life of Luther, ch. v., p. 126–130.—*Tr.*]

(28) See his letter on this conference, in *Val. Ern. Lœscher's* Acta et Documenta Reformat., tom. iii., c. viii., p. 215, [and in *Gerdes*, Historia Evang. renovati, tom. i., Append., p. 203–209. It exhibits a lucid and candid statement of the whole proceeding.—*Tr.*]

for industry as a scholar. He performed, for philosophy and the other liberal arts, what *Luther* performed for theology; that is, he freed them from the corruptions they had contracted, restored them, and gave them currency in Germany. He possessed an extraordinary ability to comprehend, and to express in clear and simple language, the most abstruse and difficult subjects and such as were exceedingly complicated. This power he so happily exerted on subjects pertaining to religion, that it may be truly said, no literary man, by his genius and erudition, has done more for the benefit of those subjects. From his native love of peace, he was induced most ardently to wish that religion might be reformed without any public schism, and that the visible brotherhood among Christians might remain entire. And hence it was, that he frequently seemed to be too yielding. Yet he by no means spared great and essential errors; and he inculcated with great constancy, that unless these were clearly exposed and plucked up by the roots, the Christian cause would never flourish. In the natural temperament of his mind, there was a native softness, tenderness, and timidity. And hence, when he had occasion to write or to do any thing, he pondered most carefully every circumstance; and often indulged fears, where there were no real grounds for them. But on the contrary, when the greatest dangers seemed to impend, and the cause of religion was in jeopardy, this timorous man feared nothing, and opposed an undaunted mind to his adversaries. And this shows, that the power of truth which he had learned, had diminished the imperfections of his natural temperament, without entirely eradicating them. Had he possessed a little more firmness and fortitude, been less studious to please every body, and been able wholly to cast off the superstition which he imbibed in early life, he would justly deserve to be accounted one of the greatest of men.(29)

(29) There is a Life of *Melancthon*, written by *Joach Camerarius*, which has been often printed. But the cause of literature would be benefited by a more accurate history of this great man, composed by some impartial and discreet writer; and also by a more perfect edition of his whole works than we now possess. [This great man (whose German name was *Schwartzerde*, in Gr. *Melancthon*. — *Tr.*) was born at Bretten, in the lower Palatinate, A D. 1497, studied at Heidelberg, and was teacher of Belles Letters at Tubingen, when he was invited, A D. 1518, by *Reuchlin* and *Luther*, to become professor of Greek at Wittemberg. He taught, wrote, and disputed, in furtherance of the same objects with *Luther*; but with more mildness and gentleness than he. He composed, so early as 1521, the first system of theology that appeared in our schools, under the title of: Loci communes rerum theologicarum: (which passed through sixty editions, in his lifetime.—*Tr.*) and greatly helped forward the reformation. He also composed the Augsburg Confession, and the Apology for it. During the reformation, he rendered service to many cities of Germany. He was also invited to France and England, but declined going. In the latter years of his life, from his love of peace, he manifested more indulgence towards the Reformed, than was agreeable to the major part of the divines of our church; and his followers were therefore called *Philippists*, to distinguish them from the more rigid Lutherans. In the year 1530, he did not entertain such views. There is a letter of his to *John Lachmann*, a preacher at Heilbron, in which he warns him to beware of the leaven of *Zwingle*; and says: Ego non sine maximis tentationibus didici, quantum sit vitii in dogmate *Cinglii*. Scis mihi veteram cum *Œcolampadio* amicitiam esse. Sed optarim eum non incidisse in hanc *conjurationem*. Non enim vocari aliter libet, quia prætextu ejus dogmatis vides, quos tumultus excitent Helvetii. See Dr. Büttinghausen's Beyträge zur Pfälzischen Geschichte, vol ii, p. 138, &c. But the death of *Luther*, correspondence with *Calvin*, his own timid and mild character, and perhaps also political considerations, rendered him more indulgent. Among the superstitious notions imbibed in his youth, and of which he could not wholly divest himself, was his credulity in regard to premonitions and dreams, and his inclination towards astrology, with which he even infected some of his pupils. (The most learned

§ 11. While the empire of the pontiffs was thus tottering in Germany, another mortal wound was inflicted on it, in the neighbouring Helvetia, by the discerning and erudite *Ulrich Zwingle*, a canon and priest of Zurich. The fact must not be disguised, that he had discovered some portion of the truth, *before Luther* openly contended with the pontiff. But afterwards, being excited and instructed by the example and the writings of *Luther*, he not only expounded the holy scriptures in public discourses, but in the year 1519 successfully opposed *Bernardin Samson* of Milan, who was impudently driving among the Swiss, the same shameful traffic, which had awakened *Luther's* ire.(30) This was the first step towards purging Switzerland of

men of that age, *Melancthon*, *Chemnitz*, *Neander*, were believers in this art; indeed, such as were not, could scarcely pass for learned men. *Henke's* Kirchengesch., vol. iii, p. 580.) He died in 1560. His works were published, collectively, A.D. 1562 and onward, 4 vols. fol. See also *Theodore Strobel's* Melancthoniana, Altdorf, 1771, 8vo.—*Schl.*]

(30) See *Jo. Hen. Hottinger's* Helvetische Reformationsgeschichte, p. 28, &c., or his Helvetische Kirchengeschichte, tom. ii., lib. vi., p. 28, &c. For the former (which is often published separately) differs very little from the latter; though it is often sold as being the first part of the latter work. [Also his Historia Ecclesiast. N. Test., sæcul xv., pt. ii., p. 198, &c.—*Tr.*] *Abram Ruchat's* Histoire de la Reformation de la Suisse, tome i., livr. i., p. 4, &c, p. 66, &c. *Dan. Gerdes*, Historia renovati Evangelii, tom. ii., p. 228, &c., [or rather tom. i., p. 99, &c.—*Tr.*] *Jo. Conrad Füsslin's* Beytrage zu der Schweitzer-Reformations Geschichte, in five Parts. [*Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, vol. i., p. 103, &c., and *H. P. C. Henke's* Algem. Geschichte der christl. Kirche., vol. iii., p. 74, ed Brunswick, 1806.—*Luther* and his followers had long and severe contests with *Zwingle* and the Reformed, respecting the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist; and this caused much alienation and prejudice between the two bodies, during the whole of the sixteenth century; nor has entire harmony been restored between them to this day. Hence, for more than two centuries, the Lutherans and the Reformed, contended, whether *Luther* or *Zwingle* was entitled to the honour of leading the way to the reformation. *Mosheim* manifestly gives the precedence to Luther. *Hottinger*, *Gerdes*, and others, give it to *Zwingle*. *Schroeckh*, *Henke*, *Schlegel*, *Von Einem*, and others, of the Lutheran church, now divide the praise between them. The facts appear to be these. *Zwingle* discovered the corruptions of the church of Rome, at an earlier period than *Luther*. Both opened their eyes gradually, and altogether without any concert; and without aid from each other. But *Zwingle* was always in advance of *Luther* in his views and opinions; and he finally carried the reformation somewhat farther than *Luther* did. But he proceeded with more gentleness, and caution, not to run before the prejudices of the people; and the circumstances in which he was placed, did not call him so early to open combat with the powers of the hierarchy; *Luther* therefore, has the honour of being the first to declare open war with the pope, and to be exposed to direct persecution. He also acted in a much wider sphere. All Germany, and even all Europe, was the theatre of his operations. *Zwingle* moved only in the narrow circle of a single canton of Switzerland. He also died young, and when but just commencing his career of public usefulness. And these circumstances have raised *Luther's* fame so high, that *Zwingle* has almost been overlooked. *Luther*, doubtless, did most for the cause of the reformation, because he had a wider field of action, was more bold and daring, and lived longer to carry on the work. But *Zwingle* was a more learned, and a more judicious man, commenced the reformation earlier, and in his little circle carried it farther.—*Ulrich Zwingle* was born at Wildhausen, county of Toggenburg, and canton of St. Gall, A.D. 1484. At the age of ten, he was sent to Basle, for education; and afterwards to Berne. Here the Dominicans endeavoured to allure him into their order; to prevent which, his father sent him to Vienna. Returning to Basle at the age of eighteen, he became a schoolmaster; and prosecuted theology at the same time, under *Thomas Wittenbach*, who was not blind to the errors of the church of Rome, and who instilled principles of free inquiry into his pupils. He preached his first sermon in 1506; and was the same year chosen pastor of Glarus, where he spent ten years. He had been distinguished in every branch of learning to which he had applied himself, and particularly in classical and elegant literature. He now devoted himself especially to Greek

superstition. *Zwingle* now vigorously prosecuted the work he had begun; and having obtained several learned men, educated in Germany, for his associates and fellow-labourers in the arduous work, he with their assistance brought the greatest part of his fellow-citizens to renounce their subjection to pontifical domination. Yet *Zwingle* proceeded in a different way from *Luther;* for he did not uniformly oppose the employment of force against the pertinacious defenders of the old superstitions; and he is said to have conceded to magistrates more authority in religious matters, than is consistent with the nature of religion.(31) But in general he was an upright man, and his intentions are worthy of the highest praise.

§ 12. We now return to *Luther*. While *Miltitz* was negotiating with him for a peace, and with some prospect of success, *John Eckius*, burning with rage, after the debate at Leipsic, hurried away to Rome, in order to hasten his destruction. Taking as associates the most powerful Dominicans in the pontificial court, and particularly their two first men, *Cajetan* and *Prierias*, he pressed *Leo* to excommunicate *Luther* forthwith. For the Dominicans most eagerly thirsted to avenge the very great injury which they conceived *Luther* had done to their whole order, first in the person

and Hebrew; and had no respect for human authorities in theology, but relied wholly on the Scriptures, which he read and explained to his people from the pulpit, with great assiduity. His fame as a preacher and divine rose high. In 1516, he was removed to the abbey of Einsiedlin, as a field of greater usefulness. He had before cautiously exposed some of the errors of the Romish church, and he now more openly assailed the doctrines of monastic vows, pilgrimages, relics, offerings, and indulgences. The next year he was chosen to a vacancy in the cathedral of Zurich; and before he accepted the office, stipulated that he should not be confined in his preaching to the lessons publicly read, but be allowed to explain every part of the Bible. He continued to read the best Latin and Greek classics, studied diligently the more eminent fathers, as Augustine, Ambrose, and Chrysostom, and pressed the study of Hebrew and the kindred dialects. He now publicly expounded the Scriptures, as the Gospels, the Epistles of Paul and Peter, &c., and inculcated, that the Bible is the only standard of religious truth. While he was thus leading the people gradually to better views of religion, in the year 1518 *Samson* came into Switzerland to sell indulgences; and the year following, on his arrival at Zurich, *Zwingle* openly opposed him, and procured his exclusion from the canton. The progress of the people in knowledge was rapid, and the reformation went forward with great success. *Luther's* books were circulated extensively, and by *Zwingle's* recommendation, though he chose not to read them himself, lest he should incur the charge of being a *Lutheran*. He was however assailed by the friends of the hierarchy, and at length accused of heresy before the council of Zurich, Jan. 1523. He now presented sixty-seven doctrinal propositions before the council, containing all the fundamental doctrines since held by the Reformed church; and offered to defend them against all opposers, by Scripture. His enemies wished to bring tradition and the schoolmen to confute him. But the council declared, that the decision must rest on the Scriptures. *Zwingle* of course triumphed; and the council decreed, that he should be allowed to preach as heretofore, unmolested; and that no preacher in the canton should inculcate any doctrine, but what he could prove from the Scriptures. The next year, 1524, the council of Zurich reformed the public worship, according to the advice of Zwingle. Thus the reformation of that canton was now completed. *Zwingle* continued to guide his flock, and to lend aid to the other portions of the church, till the month of October, 1531; when a Catholic force from the popish cantons, marched against Zurich; and *Zwingle*, according to the usage of his country, bore the standard amid the citizens that attempted to repel them. The enemy were victorious, and *Zwingle* was slain near the commencement of the battle, and his body cut to pieces and burned to ashes. See the writers before referred to, particularly *Hottinger*, *Gerdes*, and *Schroeckh*; also the article *Zwingle*, in *Rees'* Cyclopædia.—His works were printed, Zurich, 1544–45, 4 vols. fol.—*Tr.*]

(31) [This charge against *Zwingle* in both parts of it, appears to be wholly groundless. See *Gerdes*, Historia Evang. renovati, tom. i., p. 287, *Supplementa.*—*Tr.*]

of their brother *Tetzel*, and then in that of *Cajetan*. Overcome by their importunate applications, and by those of their friends and abettors, *Leo* X. most imprudently issued the first bull against *Luther*, on the 15th of June, 1520; in which forty one of his tenets were condemned, his writings adjudged to the flames, and he was commanded to confess his faults within sixty days, and implore the clemency of the pontiff, or be cast out of the church.(32)

§ 13. As soon as *Luther* heard of this first sentence of the pontiff, he consulted for his own safety by renewing his appeal from the pontiff to the supreme tribunal of a future council. And foreseeing that this appeal would be treated with contempt at Rome, and that as soon as the time prescribed by the pontiff was elapsed he would be excommunicated by another bull, he soon formed the resolution to withdraw from the Romish church, before he should be excommunicated by the new rescript of the pontiff. In order to proclaim this secession from the Romish community, by a public act, he on the 10th of December, 1520, caused a fire to be kindled without the walls of the city, and in presence of a vast multitude of spectators, committed to the flames the bull issued against him, together with a copy of the pontifical canon law. By this act, he publicly signified that he would be no longer a subject of the Roman pontiff; and consequently, that the second decree, which was daily expected from Rome, would be nugatory. For whoever publicly burns the statute-book of his prince, protests, by so doing, that he will no longer respect and obey his authority; and one who has excluded himself from any society, cannot afterwards be cast out of it. I must suppose, that *Luther* acted in this matter with the advice of the jurists. *Luther* withdrew however, only from the *Romish* church which looks upon the pontiff as infallible, and not from the church *universal*, the sentence of which pronounced in a legitimate and free council, he did not refuse to obey. And this circumstance will show, why wise men among the papists who were attached to the liberties of Germany, looked upon this bold act of *Luther* without offence.(33)

(32) The friends of the pontiffs confess, that *Leo* erred greatly, in this matter. See *Jo. Fred. Mayer's* Diss. de Pontificiis Leonis X. processum adversus Lutherum improbantibus; which is a part of the work he published at Hamburg, 1698, 4to, with the following title: Ecclesia Romana reformationis Lutheranæ patrona et cliens. And there were at that time, many wise and circumspect persons at Rome, who did not hesitate publicly to avow their disapprobation of the violent counsels of *Eckius* and the Dominicans, and who wished to wait for the issue of *Miltitz's* embassy. [See *Riederer's* Nachrichten zur Kirchen-Gelehrten-und Buchergeschichte, Stuck ii., n. 18, p. 178, where there is an anonymous letter from Rome to *Pirkheimer*, saying: Scias neminem Romæ esse, si saltem sapiat, qui non certo certius sciat et cognoscat, Martinum in pluribus veritatem dicere, verum boni ob tyrannidis metum dissimulant, mali vero, quia veritatem audire coguntur, insaniunt. Inde illorum oritur indignatio pariter et metus; valde enim timent, ne res latius serpat. Hæc causa fuit, cur bulla tam atrox emanaverit, multis bonis et prudentibus viris reclamantibus, qui suadebant maturius consulendum, et Martino potius modestia et rationibus quam detestationibus occurrendum esse, hoc enim decere mansuetudinem, illud vero tyrannidem sapere, et rem mali exempli videri.—*Schl.*]

(33) [Some modern jurists, as *Schlegel* tells us, have condemned this act of *Luther*, as being a treasonable act against the established laws of the land. But it was not so, in that age. For the canon law contained enactments only of the popes and councils, with which the civil powers were supposed to have no concern. It was the statute-book of a foreign and spiritual sovereign, who claimed jurisdiction equally over the temporal sovereigns of Germany and over their subjects. To burn this book therefore was treason against that foreign sovereign, the pope; but not so, against the temporal sovereigns of Germany.—*Luther's* motives for this act,

Before one month after this heroic deed of *Luther* had elapsed, on the 4th day of January, 1521, the second bull of *Leo* against *Luther* was issued; in which he was expelled from the bosom of the Romish church, for having violated the majesty of the pontiff.(34)

§ 14. When these severe bulls had been issued against the person and the doctrines of *Luther* and his friends, nothing remained for him but to attempt to found a new church opposed to that of Rome, and to establish a system of doctrine consonant to the holy scriptures. For to subject himself to the dominion of his most cruel enemy, would have been madness; and to return again, contrary to the convictions of his own mind, to the errors he had opposed and rejected, would have been base and dishonest. From this time therefore, he searched for the truth with redoubled ardour, and not only revised and confirmed more carefully the doctrines he had already advanced, but likewise boldly attacked the very citadel of the pontifical authority, and shook it to its foundation. In his heroic enterprise, he had the aid of other excellent men in various parts of Europe, as well as of the doctors at Wittemberg who joined his party, and especially of *Philip Melancthon*. And as the fame of *Luther's* wisdom and heroism, and the great learning of *Melancthon*, drew a vast number of young men to Wittemberg, the principles of the reformation were spread with amazing rapidity through various nations.(35)

§ 15. In the mean time, [January 12th, 1519], the emperor *Maximilian* I. died; and his grandson *Charles* V. king of Spain, was elected his successor, on the 28th of July A.D. 1519. *Leo* X. therefore reminded the new emperor of the office he had assumed of *advocate* and *defender of the church*, and called upon him to inflict due punishment upon that rebellious member of the church *Martin Luther*. On the other hand, *Frederic* the Wise of Saxony, counselled him not to proceed rashly and improperly against *Luther*, but to conduct the whole business according to the rights of the Germanic churches and the laws of the empire. *Charles* was under greater obligations to *Frederic*, than to any other of the German princes. For it was principally by his efforts and zeal, that *Charles* had obtained the imperial dignity, in preference to his very potent rival, *Francis* I. king of France.(36) In order therefore to gratify both this friend, (to whom he owed every thing), and likewise the pontiff, he determined to give *Luther* a hearing before the diet to be assembled at Worms, prior to the

he himself stated in a tract on the subject. Among them were these, *first*, that his enemies had burned *his* books, and he must burn theirs in order to deter the people from reverencing them and being led astray by them; and *secondly*, that he had found thirty abominable assertions, in the canon law, which rendered the book worthy of the flames. —*Tr.*]

(34) Both these *Bulls* are in the Bullarium, [ed. *Cherub*, Luxemb., 1742, tom i., p. 610, &c., p. 614, &c.— *Tr.*] and also in *Christ. Matth. Pfaff's* Histor. Theol litter., tom ii., p 42, &c. [The excommunicating bull was an attack upon the rights of the German churches. For *Luther* had appealed to an ecclesiastical council; and in consequence of this appeal, the pope could no longer have jurisdiction of the case. Hence the number of *Luther's* friends increased the more, after the publication of this bull.—*Schl.*]

(35) On the rapid progress of the reformation in Germany, *Dan. Gerdes* treats particularly, in his Historia renovati Evangelii, tom. ii.; also *Benj. Grosch*, in his Vertheidigung der Evangelischen Kirche gegen Arnold, p. 156, &c.

(36) [During the six months of the interregnum, *Frederic* had been at the head of the Germanic empire, had refused the imperial crown offered to himself, and had greatly exerted himself to secure the election of *Charles.*—*Tr.*]

passing of any decree against him. It may seem strange, and contrary to ecclesiastical law, for an ecclesiastical cause to be discussed and subjected to examination before a diet. But it must be recollected, that as the archbishops, bishops, and some of the abbots, had seats among the princes, those Germanic diets were at the same time provincial councils of the German nation, to which, according to ancient canon law, the trial of such causes as that of *Luther* properly belonged.

§ 16. *Luther* therefore appeared at Worms, protected by a safe conduct from the emperor, and on the 17th and 18th of April boldly pleaded his cause before the diet. Being called upon and admonished to renounce the opinions he had hitherto defended, and to become reconciled to the pope; he replied with great constancy, that he would never do so, unless first convinced of error, by proofs from the holy scriptures or from sound reason. And, as neither promises nor menaces could move him from his purpose, he obtained indeed from the emperor the liberty of returning home unmolested, but after his departure, on the 27th of May, by the joint voices of the emperor and the princes, he and his adherents were proscribed and declared to be enemies of the Roman-Germanic empire. His prince, *Frederic*, foreseeing this storm, caused him to be intercepted on his return near Eisenach, by persons in disguise, and to be conducted to the castle of Wartburg; (perhaps with the privity of the emperor); and in that castle, which he called his *Patmos*, he lay concealed ten months, beguiling the time very profitably with writing and study.(37)

(37) See the writers, mentioned by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Centifolium Lutheranum, pt. i., cap. xliii., p. 79–84, and pt. ii., p. 563, &c. [This journey to Worms was a very perilous undertaking for *Luther* His friends advised him not to go; and even the electoral prince his sovereign, did not allow him to go, till he had obtained for him a safe conduct from the emperor. This safe conduct however, would have afforded him no protection against the operations of the papal bulls and the snares of his enemies, if the high-minded emperor had been willing to listen to those who whispered in his ear the inhuman and unchristian maxim, that a man is not to keep his promise to a heretic. But the emperor had nobler views; and *Luther* himself was so unshaken, that he would let nothing deter him from the journey; and when arrived in the territory of Worms, and some persons in the name of his friend *Spalatin* warned him of his danger, he replied, that he would go thither, if there were as many devils there, as tiles on the roofs of their houses. He therefore proceeded fearlessly to Worms, and when there, showed indescribable fortitude. He was conducted, in his monkish dress, from his lodgings to the assembled diet, by the marshal of the empire, *Von Pappenheim;* and two questions were now put to him by the official of the archbishop of Treves, namely, whether he acknowledged those books, that were laid upon a bench before him, to be his productions; and whether he would recall the opinions contained in them. To the first question, *Luther* was on the point of answering at once affirmatively; but Dr. *Jerome Schurf*, a jurist of Wittemberg, who had been assigned to him as his counsellor, reminded him that he should first ascertain whether there were not some books among them that were not his. So he heard the titles read over; and then answered to the first question, *Yes*. But to the second question, at the suggestion of his counsellor, he requested to be allowed till the next day, to consider of his answer. The following day he appeared, and the question being repeated, he answered by making distinctions. Some of his writings, he said, treated of a Christian's faith and life, others were directed against the papacy, and others against private individuals, who defended the Romish tyranny, and assailed his holy doctrines. As for the first, he could not renounce them, because even his enemies admitted that they contained much good matter; nor could he renounce the second, because that would be lending support to the papal tyranny; in those of the third class, he freely acknowledged, that he had often been too vehement; yet he could not at once renounce them, unless it were first shown, that he had gone too far. As the official now demanded of him a categorical answer, whether he would re-

§ 17. From this his *Patmos*, *Luther* returned to Wittemberg in the month of March, 1522, without the knowledge or consent of the elector *Frederic*; being influenced by the commotions which, he was informed, *Carolostadt* and others were producing hurtful to religion and the commonwealth. For in *Luther's* absence, *Andrew Carolostadt* a doctor of Wittemburg, a man of learning and not ignorant of the truth, whom the pontiff at the instigation of *Eckius* had excommunicated in conjunction with *Luther*, but a man of precipitancy and prone to an excess of ardour, had begun to destroy images, and had put himself at the head of a fanatical sect who in several places greatly abused, as is common, the dawning of liberty.(38)

nounce, or not; he replied, that he could not, unless he was first convicted of error, either by scripture, or by reason. And the official alleging, that he *must* have erred, because he had contradicted the pope and the councils; he answered: The pope and ecclesiastical councils have often erred, and have contradicted themselves. He at last closed with this declaration: *Here I stand: I can say no more: God help me. Amen.* After this, *Luther* appeared no more before the diet; but the emperor caused him to be informed, that as he would not be reconciled to the church, the emperor would do as law required; he must however repair to his usual residence, within 21 days. On the eighth of May, the bill of outlawry was drawn up against him; which was published, a few days after his departure. (*Pallavicini* says, Hist. concil. Trident., lib. i., c. 28, § 7, that the bill was drawn up May 25th, and signed May 26th, but dated back to May 8th. The reason, it is said, was, that the bill was passed at the close of the diet, and when many of the members had retired, and it was wished to disguise that fact.—*Tr.*) By virtue of this bill, after the 21 days of the safe conduct expired, no man might harbour or conceal *Luther*, on pain of treason; but whosoever might find him, in any place, was to apprehend him, and deliver him up to the emperor; and all his adherents were to be seized in the public streets, imprisoned and stripped of all their goods. This arbitrary decree of the emperor contravened all the laws of humanity, as well as the rights of the German churches. For it required a man to renounce what he was not convinced was wrong; and on the assumption of the infallibility of the pope, condemned him, against an intervening appeal to a council. This bill of outlawry however, produced very little effect; and indeed, the emperor does not seem to have been much in earnest in respect to it. For although the perplexed state of his affairs, the political movements of Europe, and the internal disquietude of his private territories, might call his attention to very different subjects from the execution of the edict of Worms, yet it is difficult to comprehend how *Luther* could safely return to Wittemberg, and there preach, and write, and teach, if the emperor did earnestly wish to give him trouble. Nay, he might easily have discovered his retreat at Wartburg. But probably the emperor took no pains to discover him, in order to avoid collision, either with the pontiff or the elector of Saxony. At Wartburg, *Luther* prosecuted the study of the Hebrew and Greek languages, commenced his German translation of the scriptures, expounded some portions of the Bible, composed his Postills, and some other works.—*Schl.*]

(38) [*Andrew Bodenstein*, born at *Carlstadt* in Franconia, (and hence called in Latin *Carolostadius*), was a doctor of biblical learning, a canon, and archdeacon of the church of All Saints at Wittemberg, and professor in the university there. He supported *Luther* in the work of reformation, as appears from the history of the conference at Leipsic, and was highly esteemed by him, and is mentioned with praise in his writings. But in respect to the manner of effecting the reformation, these two men had very different views. *Carolostadt* would have the abuses of popery abolished at once, but *Luther* preferred a gradual process. The monks of *Luther's* fraternity at Wittemberg, the Augustinians, had, during his absence, begun to reform their monastery, and to abolish the mass; and they now wished to effect the same reform in the city. But the court were afraid lest it should give offence both to other princes and cities and also to the citizens themselves; and the elector therefore, called for the opinion of the professors at Wittemberg. Their opinion was in favour of abolishing the mass; but this did not satisfy the court. *Luther*, whose opinion was also asked, assumed the rational principle, that the reformation should commence, not with the pictures, nor with other external things, among which he accounted the mass, but with the understandings of the people; and to his opinion, all the professors now subscribed, except only *Carolostadt*. He gathered

He therefore first energetically repressed the impetuosity of this man, wisely declaring that errors must first be extirpated from people's minds, before the insignia of those errors can be advantageously removed. And to establish this principle by facts and by his own example, inviting certain learned men to aid him, he proceeded gradually to perfect and to finish the German translation of the Bible, which he had commenced.(39) The event confirmed the excellence of his plan; for the parts of this work being successively published and circulated, the roots of inveterate errors were soon extirpated from the minds of vast numbers.

§ 18. In the mean time, *Leo* X. died, A.D. 1522. *Hadrian* VI. of Utrecht, succeeded him, by the aid of *Charles* V., whose tutor he had been. He was an honest man, and so ingenuous as to confess that the Christian church laboured under ruinous maladies, and to promise readily that he would correct them.(40) By his legate to the diet of Nuremberg, A.D.

around him the common people; and as soon as he thought himself strong enough, he broke out, and with a throng of enthusiastic followers rushed into the cathedral church, destroyed the pictures and the altar, and hindered the clergy from any longer saying mass. *Melancthon* was too timid to control this uproar. *Luther* therefore came forward, preached against these violent innovations, and restored tranquillity. From that time onward, there was a coldness between *Luther* and *Corolostadt*, which at length broke out into hostilities that were no honour to either of them.—*Schl.* *Luther* has been taxed with opposing *Carolostadt*, from motives of ambition, or from unwillingness that another should take the lead in any thing. And this censure is repeated by *Maclaine*, *Bower*, &c. But *Seckendorf* (Historia Lutheranismi, lib. i., § 121, p. 197, 198), seems to have confuted the charge; which has no support, except a single sentence in one of *Luther's* letters, in which he charges *Carolostadt* with wishing to be foremost; a charge, which *Melancthon* advanced in quite as strong terms. For an account of *Carolostadt* prior to 1522, see *Gerdes*, Miscellan. Groning., tom. i., p. 1, &c.—*Tr.*]

(39) A history of *Luther's* German translation of the Holy Scriptures, which contributed more than any thing else to establish the Lutheran church, was published by *Jo. Fred Mayer*, Hamb., 1701, 4to. A much fuller history was long expected from *Jo. Melchior Kraft*, than whom no one laboured upon the subject with greater care, assiduity, and success, during many years. But a premature death frustrated our expectations. Compare *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Centifolium Lutheranum, pt i., p. 147, &c., and pt. ii., p. 617, &c. [What *Kraft* was prevented by a premature death from accomplishing, has since been performed, by *Jo. Ceo. Palm*, in his Historie der teutchen Bibelübersetzung Lutheri; which was published, with notes, by *Jo. Melchior Götze*, Halle, 1772, 4to, and *Gottl. Christ. Giese*, historische Nachricht von dieser Bibelübersetzung; published by *Reiderer*, Altdorf, 1771, 8vo. —*Schl.*]

(40) See *Casper Burmann's* Hadrianus VI. sive Analecta historica de Hadriano VI. Papa Romano; Utrecht, 1727, 4to. [This is a collection of historical papers relating to the life of this pope. *Hadrian* was of humble parentage, but of great attainments in scholastic theology; and therefore had long filled the office of a professor at Louvain. He had a natural aversion to pomp, extravagance, and luxury, and a very upright disposition. He therefore did not grasp the fire and sword, in order to still the complaints of the Germans, but commenced with the reformation of his own court, curtailed his own table, dismissed all superfluous servants, and required of the cardinals a more retired life, and retrenchment in their expenses. But this was so displeasing to the Romans, that they not only lampooned him much, during his lifetime, but spoke very ill of him after his death. Indeed it has been suspected, that they were instrumental of his death. So gratifying to the Romish populace was his decease, that the night after it took place, the front door of his principal physician was decorated with a wreath of flowers, surmounted with the inscription: *For the deliverer of his country.*—*Schl.* This pontiff was deeply sensible of vast corruption in the Romish church, and he was sincerely resolved to reform it, as fast as possible. In his instructions to his legate to the diet of Nuremberg, A.D. 1522, he authorized him to say: Scimus in hac sancta sede aliquot jam annis multa abominanda fuisse, abusus in spiritualibus, excessus in mandatis, et omnia denique in perversum mutata. Nec mirum si ægritudo a capite in membra, a

1522 and onward, *Francis Cheregati*, he indeed earnestly entreated that the punishment decreed against *Luther* and his adherents by the edict of Worms might no longer be delayed, but at the same time he showed himself ready to correct the evils, which had armed so great an enemy against the church. The German princes deeming this a favourable opportunity, while the emperor was absent in Spain, demanded a free council, which should be held in Germany, and should deliberate in the ancient manner on a general reformation of the church. They also exhibited a list of one hundred grievances, of which the Germans complained as proceeding from the Romish court; and they passed a decree, forbidding any further innovations in religious matters, till the council should decide what ought to be done.(41) For so long as the princes of Germany were ignorant of the plans under consideration in Saxony for establishing a new church in opposition to that of Rome, they were pretty well united in opposing the pontifical power, which they all felt to be excessive; nor were they much troubled about *Luther's* controversy with the pontiff, which they regarded merely as a private affair.

§ 19. The honest pontiff *Hadrian*, after a short reign [of two years and eight months], died [September 24th] in the year 1523; and was succeeded on the 19th of November, by *Clement* VII., a man less ingenuous and open hearted.(42) By another legate *Laurentius Campegius*, in the same diet, A.D. 1524, *Clement* censured immoderately the lenity of the princes in tolerating *Luther*, at the same time craftily suppressing all notice of the promise of a reformation made by *Hadrian*. The emperor seconded the demands of *Campegius*, requiring by his minister that the decree of Worms should be confirmed. Overcome by these remonstrances the princes changed indeed the language of the decree, but in reality corroborated it. For they engaged to enforce the edict of Worms to the extent of their power, but at the same time renewed their demand for a council, and referred all other questions to the next diet to be held at Spire. After the diet, the pontifical legate retired with a number of the princes, most of whom were bishops, to Ratisbon; and from them he obtained a promise, that they would enforce the edict of Worms in their territories.

§ 20. While the religious reformation by *Luther* was thus daily gathering strength in almost all parts of Europe, two very serious evils arose to retard its progress, the one internal, and the other external. Among those whom the Romish bishop had excluded from the privileges of his community, a pernicious controversy, respecting the *manner* in which the body and blood of Christ are present in the sacred supper, produced very

summis pontificibus in alios inferiores prælatos descenderit. Omnes nos (the prelates) et ecclesiastici declinavimus, unusquisque in vias suas, nec fuit jam diu, qui faceret bonum, non fuit usque ad unum. See *Raynald's* Annales Eccles., ad ann. 1522, § 70. —*Tr.*]

(41) See *Jac. Fred. George*, Gravamina Germanorum adversus sedem Roman., lib. ii., p. 327. [The Gravamina are also inserted in *Flacius*, Catalogus Testium veritatis, No. 187.—*Schl.*]

(42) See *Jac. Ziegler's* Historia Clementis VII., in *Jo. Geo. Schelhorn's* Amœnitates Hist. Eccles., tom. ii, p. 210, &c. [*Clement* VII. was a kind of *Leo* X., and was previously called *Julius de Medicis*. He was of a very different spirit from *Hadrian*, was crafty and faithless, and made it his great aim through his whole reign to advance the interests of the pontifical chair. He therefore took all pains to thwart the designs of the Germans in regard to a general council for reforming the abuses of the papal court. See *Walch's* Hist. der Römischen Päpste, 379, &c.—*Schl.*]

great disunion. *Luther* and his adherents, while they rejected the dogma of the Romish school that the bread and wine are transmuted into the body and blood of Christ, yet maintained that persons coming to the sacred supper participated truly, though in an inexplicable manner, of the body and blood of Christ, together with the bread and the wine.(43) His colleague *Carolostadt*, held a different opinion.(44) And after him, *Ulrich Zwingle* much more fully and ingeniously maintained in his publications, that the body and blood of the Lord are not present in the holy supper; but that the bread and the wine are merely *symbols* or *emblems*, by which people should be excited to commemorate the death of Christ and the blessings resulting to us from it.(45) As this doctrine was embraced by nearly all the Swiss,

(43) [*Luther* denied *transubstantiation*, that is, a transmutation of the substance of the bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ; yet he held *consubstantiation*, that is, a real and corporeal presence of the body and blood of Christ *in*, *under*, or along *with*, the bread and wine; so that the sacramental substances, after consecration, became each of them *twofold;* namely, the bread became both bread and the flesh of Christ, and the wine became both wine and the blood of Christ. Sometimes however he represented the union of the two substances in each element as constituting but *one substance*, just as the union of the divine and human natures in Christ, still constituted but *one person*. The ubiquity of Christ's *body* was an obvious consequence of his doctrine, and one which he did not hesitate to admit. See *Hospinian's* Historia Sacramentaria, pt. ii., p. 5, &c.—*Tr.*]

(44) [*Carolostadt* supposed that when Christ said, *This is my body*, he pointed to his body; so that the affirmation related solely to his real body and not to the sacramental bread. His foes charged him with denying any kind of presence of Christ in the sacrament, even a spiritual or sacramental presence. See *Hospinian*, l. c., p. 50, &c. —*Tr.*]

(45) See *Val. Ern. Löscher's* Historia motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformatos, part i., lib., i., cap. ii., p. 55. And on the other side, *Abrah. Scultetus*, Annales Evangelii; in *Herm. von der Hardt's* Historia litterar. Reformat., p. 74, &c. *Rud. Hospinian*, [Historia Sacramentaria, pt. ii.], and the others among the Reformed, who give account of the origin and progress of the controversy.—[The Romish doctrine of the real or corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist, which was brought into the church principally by the efforts of *Paschasius Radbert*, in the ninth century, (see above, vol. ii., p. 89, &c.), but which was warmly contested by *Berengarius* in the eleventh century, (see above, vol. ii, p. 193, &c.), and openly denied by *Wickliffe* in the fifteenth, (see above, vol. ii., p. 381, note 34), was too absurd, not to engage the attention of the reformers. As early as A.D. 1513, *Conrad. Pelican* and *Wolfg. Fabr. Capito*, in a private interview, disclosed to each other their conviction of the absurdity of this doctrine. (See *Gerdes*, Historia Evang. renov., tom. i., p. 113). *Luther* however, while he denied the Romish doctrine of *transubstantiation*, yet held to the real presence, in the way called *consubstantiation*. Most of the other reformers, especially in southern Germany and Switzerland, disbelieved the real or corporeal presence of Christ, and maintained only a spiritual presence. Yet they did not think it expedient to write or preach on the subject, till the public mind should be ripe for such a discussion. Indeed they were not fully settled in their own minds, what form to give to the doctrine, or what interpretation to put upon the texts relied on in proof of the real presence. In the month of Jan., 1524, *Zwingle* offered to the senate of Zurich 67 doctrinal theses; in No. 18 of which he declared the eucharist to be *not a sacrifice* (non esse sacrificium), but a *commemoration* of the sacrifice once offered on the cross, and a *seal* of the redemption by Christ (sed sacrificii in cruce semel oblati commemorationem et quasi sigillum redemptionis per Christum). (See *Gerdes*, l. c., Append., p. 223.) These theses were cordially adopted by the senate of Zurich; and they met the general approbation of the Reformed in that vicinity. As early as the year 1521, *Cornelius Hone* a learned Dutch jurist, in a letter which was privately circulated, explicitly denied the corporeal presence, and maintained that the word is, in the declaration of Christ, *This is my body*, is equivalent to *represents* or *denotes*. (See the Letter, in *Gerdes*, l. c., Append., p. 228–240.) This letter *Zwingle* first read in 1524; and approving of it perfectly, he the next year caused it to be published. In the same year, 1524, *Zwingle* wrote a letter to a friend, in which he fully declares his belief that the bread and wine were merely em-

and by not a few divines in upper Germany, and as *Luther* and his friends on the other hand strenuously contended for *his* doctrine, a long and pain-

blems or representatives of Christ's body and blood: but he charged his friend not to make the letter public, lest it should produce commotion. The letter however was published the next year. At Wittemberg, *Carolostadt* was the first to reject and impugn the doctrine of the real presence. After his rebuke from Luther, (for destroying the altars and images at Wittemberg in 1522), he retired to Orlamund, not far from Leipsic; and there becoming a parish minister, he inveighed against images and the mass, and denied the doctrine of the real presence. The people fell in with his views, to the great dissatisfaction of the elector and *Luther*. Therefore in Aug., 1524, *Luther* was sent to reclaim the wandering people. At Jena he declaimed against the innovators, with great warmth. *Carolostadt* was present, and feeling himself injured by this public attack, went to *Luther's* lodgings and complained of his abuse. Hard words were used on both sides. *Carolostadt* taxed *Luther* with erroneous doctrine, particularly in regard to the real presence. *Luther* challenged him to a public controversy on the subject. *Carolostadt* accepted the challenge; but being soon banished from Saxony, and retiring first to Strasburg and then to Basle, it was from the last of these places he issued his first publication. (See the account of the dispute at Jena, in *Luther's* works, vol. ii., fol. 446, &c., ed. Jena, 1580.) Among the tracts here published by *Carolostadt*, one was entitled: On the words of Christ, *This is my body*. He supposed Christ to have *pointed to* his body, when he uttered these words; and to have intended to indicate, that the sacramental bread was an *emblem* of his body. Luther now wrote to the Strasburgers, against *Carolostadt*. *Capito* and *Bucer* both published tracts on the dispute between *Luther* and *Carolostadt*, endeavouring to exhibit the difference in doctrine as not material, and to stop controversy on the subject. But early the next year, 1525, *Luther* issued his full and keen reply to *Carolostadt*, entitled, Against the heavenly Prophets, in two Parts. *Œcolampadius*, *Zwingle*, and others in South Germany and Switzerland, viewed *Carolostadt* as substantially correct in doctrine, but not happy in his statements and reasonings. *Zwingle* compared him to a new recruit, who did not know how to put on his armour. And as the subject of the eucharist was now under discussion, and the writings of both *Luther* and *Carolostadt* circulating around them, they deemed it proper to engage in the controversy, and endeavour to enlighten and guide their people to right conclusions. Both *Œcolampadius* and *Zwingle* therefore published their views of the controversy. And in March, 1525, *Zwingle* published his Commentarius de vera et falsa religione; in which he distinctly, but concisely, stated his views of the eucharist. And in June following, he enlarged on that point, in his Subsidium de eucharistia. *Œcolampadius's* principal publication was in the form of a letter addressed to his friends in Swabia, and entitled a Genuine exposition of the words of our Lord, *This is my body*, according to the most ancient authors. *Zwingle* and *Œcolampadius* both maintained the bread and wine to be mere *symbols* or *representatives* of Christ's body and blood. But they differed as to the interpretation of the words, *This is my body*. *Zwingle* adopted *Hone's* opinion, that the word is, is used catachrestically, for *represents;* but *Œcolampadius* placed the trope on the word *body*, supposing it to be used metonymically, for *memorial* or *emblem of my body*. *Bugenhagius* of Wittemberg, now wrote against *Zwingle* and *Œcolampadius;* and *Zwingle* replied to him. In the year 1526, *Brentius* and fourteen other ministers of Swabia replied to *Œcolampadius*, in a work entitled Syngramma Suevicum; which was soon translated into German, and published with a harsh preface by *Luther*. *Œcolampadius* and *Zwingle* both replied to Luther's preface. *Luther* now published his sermon against the Enthusiasts; to which Zwingle wrote two letters in reply. *Martin Bucer* also wrote to *Brentius* and the other Swabians, censuring their indiscreet zeal. On the other side, *Jo. Pomeranus* of Wittemberg published a letter against *Zwingle* and the Reformed; to which *Zwingle* and also *Michael Cellarius* of Augsburg replied. *Conrad Pellican* and *Leo Juda* appeared on the side of the Reformed; and *Erasmus*, *Bilianus*, and *Osiander*, on that of the Lutherans. In the year 1527, *Zwingle* addressed a work to *Luther*, entitled Amica exegesis, id est, expositio eucharistiæ negotii. And about the same time *Luther* published his very severe German work, entitled, That the words of Christ, *This is my body*, still stand fast, against the enthusiastic spirits. *Œcolampadius* replied, and also *Zwingle:* the latter, in a German work, entitled, That the words of Christ, &c., will ever have their ancient and only meaning, and that *M. Luther*, in his last work, has not substantiated his and the pope's sense. In this year *Pomeranus*, *Pirkheime-*

ful controversy commenced in the year 1524, which at last, after many fruitless attempts at a compromise, produced a lamentable schism among those that seceded from the papal jurisdiction.

§ 21. Extraneous to the Lutheran community, there arose in the year 1525, like a sudden tornado, an innumerable multitude of seditious and delirious fanatics, in various parts of Germany, who declared war against the laws and the magistrates, and spread rapine, conflagration, and slaughter through the community. The greatest part of this furious rabble consisted of peasants, who were discontented under the government of their lords; and hence this calamity has been commonly called the *war of the peasants*.(46) Yet it is manifest, there were not a few persons of various

rus, *Clichtovius*, and bishop *Fisher* of England, came out against the Reformed; but *Regius* and *Billicanus* espoused their cause. In 1528, *Luther* published his most methodical work on this subject, entitled a Confession of faith respecting the Lord's Supper: to which both *Œcolampadius* and *Zwingle* replied; the latter in a long and elaborate work, addressed to *John* elector of Saxony and *Philip* landgrave of Hesse. *Bucer* also replied to it. And *Œcolampadius* wrote to *Melancthon*, requesting him to use efforts for moderating the hostility of the Lutherans towards the Reformed, who only claimed toleration and brotherly affection. In 1529, several letters passed between *Œcolampadius* and *Melancthon*. The Strasburgers and *Erasmus* also exchanged polemic letters on the doctrine. In September of this year, *Philip* landgrave of Hesse, invited the Lutheran and Reformed champions to a friendly conference at Marpurg. The Lutherans reluctantly attended, being resolved not to make peace with those who should deny the real presence, and despairing of convincing the Reformed on that subject. *Luther*, *Melancthon*, and *Justus Jonas*, from Saxony, *Andrew Osiander* of Nuremberg, *Brentius* of Halle in Swabia, and *Stephen Agricola* of Augsburg, were present, on the side of the Lutherans. On the side of the Reformed, *Zwingle*, *Œcolampadius*, *Bucer* and *Hedio*, attended without hesitation. In the discussion, *Luther* and *Œcolampadius* were pitted against each other; and also *Zwingle* and *Melancthon*. They agreed perfectly, on fourteen essential articles of faith; but could not agree respecting the real presence. The landgrave wished them, nevertheless, to view each other as brethren. *Zwingle* and his friends heartily consented; but *Luther* refused. In November of this year, the Lutheran states entered into an alliance, called the league of Smalcald; but refused to admit the Strasburgers and the other Reformed cities and states into it. In 1530, the Lutherans, the Strasburgers, and also *Zwingle*, severally presented confessions of their faith to the diet of Augsburg; all drawn up with moderation and care. The princes perceived their agreement in all essential points, and were disposed to admit the Reformed to the league. But *Luther* and *Melancthon* opposed it, and prevailed. *Philip* however, landgrave of Hesse, entered into a league with the Reformed for mutual defence against the papists. And Strasburg, Zurich, Basle, and Bern formed an alliance for the same purpose, for fifteen years. In this year, *Melancthon* published his testimonies from the fathers in favour of the real presence; and *Œcolampadius* replied elaborately in the form of a dialogue. In 1531, *Zwingle* and *Œcolampadius* both died; and the Reformed weakened by the loss of these two great men, and pressed with danger from the papists, against whom their Lutheran brethren would not befriend them so long as they denied the real presence, began to waver and try to swallow the Lutheran creed. *Bucer* led the way; and the Strasburgers followed him. The controversy subsided in a great measure. Yet the Swiss and numerous others continued to deny the real corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist. This controversy it was, produced the division of the Protestants into the two great bodies of *Lutherans* and *Reformed*. See, for the facts here condensed, the authors mentioned at the beginning of this note, and *Schroeckh's* Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation, vol. i., p. 351, &c., and p. 420, &c.—*Tr.*]

(46) Such insurrections of the peasants had been very common, before the times of *Luther;* as appears from numerous examples. Hence the author of the Chronicon Danicum, published by *Jo. Pet. a Ludewig*, Reliquar. Manuscriptor. tom. ix., p. 59, calls them *the common evil* (*commune malum*). See also p. 80 and 133. This will not appear strange, if it be recollected, that the condition of the peasants in most places, was much more insupportable than at the present day; and that the oppression of many of the barons, prior to the reformation, was really intolerable. [In many places the

descriptions engaged in it; some were fanatics, others vicious and idle persons allured by the hope of living comfortably on the fruits of other people's labour. This sedition, at its commencement, was altogether of a *civil* nature; as appears from the paper published by them: for these peasants only wished to be relieved of some part of their burdens, and to enjoy greater freedom. Respecting religion, there was no great dispute. But when the fanatic *Thomas Munzer*, who had before deceived several by his ficticious visions and dreams, and some other persons of a similar character, had joined this irritated multitude, from being a *civil* commotion, it became, especially in Saxony and Thuringia, a religious or holy war. The sentiments however of this dissolute and infuriate rabble were very different. Some demanded an unintelligible freedom from law, and the abrogation of all lordships; others only wished to have their taxes and their burdens as citizens made lighter; others contemplated the formation of a new and perfectly pure church, and pretended to be inspired; and others again were hurried away by their passions and their hatred of the magistrates, but without having any very definite object in view. Hence, though it must be admitted that many of them misunderstood *Luther's* doctrine concerning Christian liberty, and thence took occasion to run wild, yet it is a great mistake, to ascribe to the influence of *Luther's* doctrines all the blame of this phrensy. Indeed *Luther* himself sufficiently refuted this calumny, by publishing books expressly against this turbulent faction. The storm subsided, after the unfortunate battle of the peasants with the army of the German princes, at Mulhausen A.D. 1525, in which *Munzer* was taken prisoner and subjected to capital punishment.(47)

peasants were treated as slaves or serfs, and bought and sold with the lands to which they were attached. And the landlords, the barons, bishops, abbots, and priests, were generally disposed to oppress and grind their tenants to the utmost. Hence they were perpetually rebelling, in one place and another. Thus A.D. 1492, the Netherland peasantry appeared in arms, to the number of 6000; and about the same time, there was an insurrection against the abbot of Kempten in Swabia. In the bishopric of Spire, there was another in 1503; and one at Wittemburg, in 1514. The next year, there was one in the Austrian dominions, in which 2000 peasants were slain. It spread into Hungary and some other countries. 400 of the nobility and gentry were butchered by the insurgents; and the whole number that perished on both sides, was estimated at 70,000. In 1517, there was another on the borders of Austria and Croatia. See *Seckendorf's* Comment. de Lutheranismo, lib. ii., sec. 1.—*Tr.*]

(47) *Peter Gnodalius*, Historia de seditione repentina vulgi, præcipue rusticorum A.D. 1525, tempore verno, per universam fere Germaniam exorta; Basil, 1570, 8vo. See also *Ern Sal.m. Cyprian's* additions to *Tenzel's* Historia Reformat., tom. ii, p. 331, &c. [This commotion of the peasants commenced in the year 1524, and in Swabia, where some subjects of the spiritual princes, civil dukes, and nobles, complained of their heavy burdens and feudal services, and demanded a relaxation. Their lords repulsed them harshly, cast some of them into prison, and even put some to death. This enkindled their rage; and presently a host of peasants were to be seen in Swabia and Franconia, who roamed from one district to another, and united the disaffected to their standard. Their rulers now gave them kind words: but it was too late: and they refused to lay down their arms, till certain articles were conceded to them. Among these, the first was, the right of electing their own preachers. And this was the only article that related to religion. They wished for preachers, who would have no respect of persons. Yet they afterwards dropped this demand. They demanded, further, the abolition of personal slavery. The tithe of produce they were willing to pay; but it must go to the support of the preachers and the poor, and to promote the public interests of the people and the country. From the tithe of cattle, or the lesser tithe, they demanded to be made free. They also demanded, that hunting and fishing should be free in the public forests, seas, and rivers; and the cutting of timber likewise; and required a diminu-

§ 22. When this alarming insurrection was at its height, *Frederic* the Wise, Elector of Saxony, closed life A.D. 1525. While he lived he had been a kind mediator between the Roman pontiff and *Luther;* nor would he give up the hope, that a righteous and honourable peace might finally be established between the contending parties, without the formation of separate communities under different regulations. Hence he did not thwart, but even favoured *Luther's* designs of purifying and reforming the church; yet he took little pains to organize and regulate the churches in his territories. *John* his brother and successor, was of a very different character. Being fully satisfied of the truth of *Luther's* doctrines, and clearly perceiving that either those doctrines must be sacrificed or the papal authority be discarded, he assumed to himself the entire jurisdiction in religious matters; and had no hesitation to establish and organize a church totally distinct from that of the pontiff. He therefore caused regulations in regard to the constitution and government of the churches, the form and mode of public worship, the official duties and the salaries of the clergy, and other things connected with the interests of religion, to be drawn up by *Luther* and *Philip Melancthon*, and to be promulgated in

tion of the personal services to be rendered to their landlords; and a reduction of the fines and penalties imposed, &c. At the same time, they declared that they would withdraw their demands, and return to obedience to their lords, if it could be shown that their demands were unreasonable; for they were not insensible, that the scriptures required obedience to magistrates. (See their own statement of their grievances, in *Luther's* works, ed. Jena, 1580, vol. iii., folio 111, followed by *Luther's* comments and exhortations to the peasants.—*Tr.*) They named *Luther* for their arbiter; and he endeavoured to enlighten them, by his sermons and writings. But the rulers themselves were the cause of the spread and prevalence of the insurrection. Fair promises were made to such as would lay down their arms; but the promises were not fulfilled; nay, many were violently seized, and put to death. In this state of things, fanatics came among them, and prompted the irritated multitude to renew their first demand, to aim higher, and to wage war against the clergy and nobility with the greatest cruelty. The most prominent of these fanatics were *Thomas Münzer*, and one *Pfeiffer*, a renouncing Præmonstratensian monk. *Münzer* was a friend of those visionaries, *Nicholas Stork*, *Mark Stubner*, and *Martin Cellarius*, who had commenced the disturbances at Wittemberg under the patronage of *Carolostadt*, but who were expelled from Wittemberg on *Luther's* return thither from Wartburg. He had been a preacher at Zwickau and at Altstadt, and had clearly shown, by his writings and his sermons, that he was not satisfied with *Luther's* reformation. (See *Lœscher's* Stromata, sec. x., p. 218, &c., and *Füessli's* Beyträge, vol. v., p. 136, 410.) He wished to abolish all distinctions of rank, and all subordination, and to introduce a perfect equality in society; and he believed, that Christ himself would soon come and set up the heavenly Jerusalem on the earth, in which there would be no civil laws, no penalties, no burdens imposed, &c. As he met with resistance generally, in Saxony, he travelled over Thuringia, Franconia, and Swabia, as far as the boundaries of Switzerland; and he blew the fire of insurrection every where by his influence, until it finally burst into a flame.—*Schl.* Meeting opposition at the south, he returned to the north and headed the insurgents of Thuringia, hoping for co-operation from those of Swabia. But the Swabian insurgents were attacked and slaughtered in their several camps, to the number, it is said, of 70,000. In the mean time, those of Thuringia, to the number of 8000, were assembled at Mulhausen, with *Münzer* for their prophet and leader. The neighbouring princes offered them capitulation, which they refused, relying on the assurance of *Münzer* that God would miraculously destroy their adversaries, and preserve them. In the battle, 4000 of the peasants (some say more) were slain. *Münzer* and *Pfeiffer* were taken and beheaded. Thus ended this war of the peasants, in the summer of 1525; in which, according to some, near 130,000 persons lost their lives. See *Seckendorf*, Comment. de Lutheranismo, lib. ii., sec. i., &c. *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. i., p. 339, &c., and *Arnold's* Kirchen- und Ketzer Historie, pt. ii., b. xvi., c. ii., vol. i., p. 626–630, ed. 1741.— *Tr*]

the year 1527 by his deputies: and he likewise took care that pious and competent teachers should be placed over all the churches, and that unsuitable ones should be excluded. His example was soon followed by the other princes and states of Germany that had cast off the dominion of the Roman pontiff; so that nearly the same institutions as he had introduced, were adopted by them. This prince may therefore not improperly be considered the second parent and founder of the Lutheran church; since he it was, who gave it salutary regulations and the supports of law, and separated it wholly from the Romish church. But it was from the times of this elector John, that the dissensions of the German princes in regard to religious and ecclesiastical subjects had their commencement, having previously been very slight. The prudence of *Frederic* the Wise, had kept their minds under restraint, and in a good degree united. But when the various proceedings of *John* made it obvious, that he designed to separate the churches of his territory entirely from the church of Rome, instantly the minds of the princes which had heretofore moved in tolerable harmony, became at variance, some adhering strongly to the old religion of their fathers, and others embracing cordially the reformed religion.

§ 23. The patrons of the old religion, without much disguise, consulted together respecting an attack to be made upon the Lutheran party by force and arms. And they would undoubtedly have carried their plans into operation, if they had not been prevented by the troubled state of Europe. The leading men among those that embraced the reformed religion, perceiving the designs of the other party, began also to consult together about forming an alliance among themselves.(48) The diet of Spire in 1526, at which *Ferdinand* the emperor's brother presided, had a more favourable issue than could have been anticipated. The emperor by his envoys, required that all contentions respecting religious subjects should cease, and that the edict of Worms against *Luther* and his associates should be confirmed. But many of the princes declared that it was not in their power to carry this edict into operation, or to pass any definite decisions on the subject, until a general council duly assembled should have examined and judged the case; for to such a body it pertained, to take the cognizance of such matters. This sentiment prevailed, after long and various discussions; and a unanimous resolve was passed, that a petition should be presented to the emperor, urging him to call a free council without delay; and that in the mean time, every one should be at liberty to manage the religious concerns of his own territory in the manner he saw fit, yet under a due sense of his accountability to God and to the emperor, for the course he might pursue.

§ 24. Nothing could have taken place more favourable to the cause of

(48) [The war of the peasants had caused repeated consultations between the neighbouring princes. And when the danger from that source began to diminish, the indications of a combination among the Catholic princes under the countenance of the emperor, led the Lutheran princes and states to hold correspondence and conventions, and at length to form alliances. In the winter of 1526, the elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse, invited the senate of Nuremberg to meet them at Torgau for such a consultation. The senate excused itself; but the two princes met on the 4th of May, and entered into an alliance for mutual defence, much the same as the league of Smalcald a few years after. They also invited other Lutheran states, to come into this alliance; which was renewed at Magdeburg, on the 12th of June of the same year. See *Seckendorf.* Comment. de Lutheranismo, lib. ii., § 15, addit. ii.—*Tr.*]

those who deemed a religious reformation necessary than this decree. For the emperor was so occupied and perplexed with his French, Spanish, and Italian affairs, that during several years, he could not give much attention to the affairs of Germany, and especially to the difficult subject of religion. And if he had been able to do something favourable to the pontifical interests, during the religious disputes in Germany, he doubtless lacked the inclination. For the Roman pontiff *Clement* VII., after *Francis* I. the king of France had been vanquished, dreading the power of the emperor in Italy, entered into an alliance with the French and the Venetians against him: and this so inflamed the resentment of *Charles*, that he abolished the pontifical authority throughout Spain, made war upon the pope in Italy, captured the city of Rome in 1527, by his general *Charles of Bourbon*, besieged the pontiff himself in the castle of St. Angelo, and permitted him to be treated with much personal abuse and indignity.(49) The professors of the reformed religion therefore, improved this opportunity and [the liberty given by] the edict of Spire, with great advantage, for strengthening and extending their cause. Some whom the fear of punishment had hitherto restrained from attempting any innovations, now unhesitatingly banished the old superstition from their territories, and caused such a system of religion and such forms of worship to be introduced as had been adopted in Saxony. Others, though they did not themselves attempt anything against the papal interests, yet gave no molestation to such as persuaded their people to renounce the pontiff; nor did they oppose the assembling in private of such as had withdrawn from his allegiance. And all those in Germany who had before rejected the Romish authority, now carefully employed the liberty afforded them, to strengthen their cause, and to regulate properly their religious affairs. During this period, *Luther* and his associates, especially those who resided with him at Wittemberg, by their writings, their preaching, their admonitions, and their refutations, added courage to the irresolute, and imparted light and animation to all.(50)

(49) [See *Wm. Robertson's* History of the reign of the emperor Charles V., vol. ii., (book iv.). *Jo. Sleidan's* Commentar. de statu relig. et reipubl., lib. iv., and others. —*Schl.*]

(50) [It was in this interval, or from A.D. 1526, that the elector of Saxony caused the noted visitation of the churches throughout his dominions. *Luther* being sick, *Melancthon* with the aid of two or three civilians drew up the instructions to the visiters. The elector's territories were divided into four districts, and different sets of visiters appointed for each, consisting of one or two clergymen and three or more civilians. *Luther* was the clerical visiter for Saxony proper; and *Melancthon* was a visiter for Misnia. The visiters were to take account of the state of all the parishes, monasteries, schools and cathedrals. They were to examine into the character and conduct of all the clergy, the monks, and school teachers; with power to remove improper men, to supply vacancies, and to assign and regulate the salaries of all. They were also to appoint superintendents; who were to be competent clergymen, commissioned to examine all young ministers, and to watch over the clergy within certain limits, to admonish the unfaithful, and if they did not reform, to report them to the civil authorities, that the sovereign might call them to account or dismiss them as he saw fit. The visiters were also to see that schools were set up in all the parishes, and provided with competent teachers; to assign the salaries of the masters; and to prescribe rules and regulations for the schools. They were directed, not to spare the vicious and profligate; but to deal tenderly with the ignorant, the aged, and infirm, and such as laboured under honest prejudices. They must cause the true faith, and sound practical religion to be every where preached: and if they found any, that conscientiously desired other preaching, they were to afford them every facility to remove to places where they could enjoy it. Similar visitations were instituted

§ 25. This tranquillity was interrupted by the second diet of Spire in 1529, which the emperor called in the spring, after settling in some measure the disquieted affairs of his empire, and coming to a compromise with the pontiff *Clement* VII. For a decree was passed by a major vote, by which the power granted three years before to every prince to regulate religious matters in his own territories as he saw fit until the meeting of a general council, was revoked; and all changes in the public religion were declared to be unlawful, until the decision of the council should take place. This decree could not fail to appear grievous and insupportable to the elector of Saxony, the landgrave of Hesse, and the other patrons of the reformation. For no one could be so ignorant as not to know, that the promises of a council to be soon assembled, were intended only to sooth their feelings; and that any thing could be sooner obtained of the Roman pontiff, than a legitimate and free council. Therefore, when they found that their arguments and reasonings made no impression upon *Ferdinand*, the emperor's brother who presided in the diet, and upon the adherents to the old religion, who were guided by the pontifical legate; they publicly remonstrated against this decree, or in the language of the jurists, they *protested* against it, on the 19th of April, and appealed to the emperor and to a future council. Hence originated the name of *Protestants*, borne from this time onward by those who forsook the communion of the Roman pontiff.(51)

§ 26. The protectors of the reformed churches, or the *Protestant* princes as they were called, immediately despatched envoys to the emperor, then on his way from Spain to Italy, to acquaint him with the stand they had taken at the diet of Spire. But these envoys, fulfilling their commission in a manly style, and daring to manifest the same firmness as those who sent them, were put under arrest by order of the emperor, and were held in that situation for a number of days. The princes anxious for the reformation, on learning this fact, concluded that their own safety depended wholly on their union and their power to defend themselves; and therefore they held several conventions at Rothach, Schwabach, Nuremberg, Smalcald, and other places, for the purpose of entering into a closer al-

by other Lutheran princes. On his return from this visitation, *Luther* was so impressed with the ignorance of both the clergy and laity, in a large part of the country, that he sat down to write his catechisms for their use. See an account of this visitation in *Seckendorf's* Comment. de Lutheranis, lib. ii., § 36, 37, p. 100–108.—*Tr.*]

(51) [The princes and states which joined in this protest, were, the elector *John* of Saxony, the margrave *George* of Brandenburg, Onolzbach and Culmbach, the dukes *Ernest* and *Francis* of Luneburg, the landgrave *Philip* of Hesse, *Wolfgang* prince of Anhalt; and fourteen imperial cities, namely, *Strasburg*, *Ulm*, *Nuremberg*, *Constance*, *Reutlingen*, *Windsheim*, *Memmingen*, *Lindau*, *Kempten*, *Heilbron*, *Isny*, *Weissenburg*, *Nordlingen*, and *St. Gall*. They appealed to the emperor, to a future general or free council of the German nation, and lastly to every impartial judge. For they believed, that a majority of votes in a diet could decide a secular question, but not a spiritual or religious question. They appealed to the emperor, not as recognising him as their judge in a matter of religion, but merely that he might allow their appeal to a council to be valid. And they subjoined the appeal to a council, because, according to the ecclesiastical law of Germany, religious controversies are not to be decided by decrees of a diet, but by a national council. We may also here remark, that this was not the *first* protest; but that in the year 1523, at the diet of Nuremberg, the elector of Saxony, and the evangelical dukes, and imperial cities, protested against the decree of the diet. See *Dr. Walch's* Diss. Historica de liberis imperii civitatibus a pace religionis nunquam exclusis, Gotting., 1755 4to.—*Schl.*]

liance for repelling the attacks of their enemies. But nothing definite was agreed upon, in consequence of the diversity of their opinions and views.(52)

§ 27. Among the hinderances to a cordial union among those who withdrew from the Romish church, the greatest was the disagreement between the Saxon and Helvetic reformers, respecting the Lord's supper. Hence in order to bring this controversy to a close, *Philip* landgrave of Hesse, appointed a conference between *Luther* and *Zwingle* and some other principal doctors of both parties, to be held at Marpurg in 1529, with a view to a compromise. But this truly *magnanimous* prince, as he was properly styled, was disappointed in his expectations. The assembled theologians disputed in presence of the landgrave, four days, or from the first day of October till the fourth, and particularly *Luther* with *Œcolampadius*, and *Melancthon* with *Zwingle*, on the various allegations against the Helvetians. For *Zwingle* was regarded by the Saxons, as not only teaching falsely respecting the Lord's supper, but as holding erroneous views respecting the divinity of the Saviour, the efficacy of the divine word, original sin, and some other subjects. *Zwingle* and his companions replied to these accusations, in such a manner as to satisfy *Luther* in regard to most of them. But the disagreement respecting the Lord's supper, could not be at all removed, both parties firmly persisting in their respective opinions.(53) The only advantage therefore derived from the conference, was, that the parties entered into a kind of truce, and depended on God and the influence of time to heal the dissension.

§ 28. The ministers of the churches which embraced the doctrines of *Luther*, were preparing a new embassy to the emperor, when it was announced that he was coming into Germany, and intended to examine and decide the controversies respecting religion, at the diet to be held at Augsburg. For the emperor, after learning the opinions of wise men respecting the momentous business, had become softened down in his feelings, and had laboured with great earnestness, first at Bologna, to persuade the pontiff of the necessity of calling a council. But being utterly unable to prevail, and the pontiff urging, in return, that it was the emperor's duty to succour the church, and to punish without delay the perverse faction of the *heretics;* he came to the conclusion that it would be unjust, and a violation of the imperial laws of Germany, to condemn worthy citizens unheard, and to make war upon them. At that time there was not extant

(52) See *Christ. Aug. Salig's* History of the Augsburg Confession; written in German, tom. i., lib. ii., cap. i., p. 128, but especially, *Jo. Joach Müller's* Historie von der Evangelischen Stände Protestation gegen den Speyerschen Reichsabschied von 1529, Appellation, &c., Jena, 1705, 4to.

(53) *Val. Ern. Lœscher's* Historia motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformatos, tom. i., lib. i., cap. vi., p. 143, &c. *Henry Bullinger's* Historia Colloquii Marpurgensis, in *Jo. Conr. Fueslin's* Beyträgen zur Schweitzer. Reformat. Geschichte, vol. iii., p. 156; also *Fueslin's* Preface, p. 80. *Abrah. Scultetus*, Annales Reformat. ad ann. 1529. *Rudolph Hospinian's* Historia Sacramentaria, part ii., p. 72, &c. [See above, p. 37, note (45). *Hospinian's* History contains, (pt. ii., page 123, &c., ed. Geneva, 1681), the whole proceedings of the conference, by *Rodolph Collin*, a schoolmaster of Zurich who attended *Zwingle* to Marpurg, took minutes of all the discussions, and then filled them out into a regular account; likewise, accounts of this conference, given in private letters to their friends, by *Melancthon*, (p. 132 and 134), by *Luther*, (p. 135), by *Œcolampadius*, (p. 137), and by *Bucer*, (p. 138): also a reply of the ministers of Zurich A.D. 1544, to false reports respecting the conference.—*Tr.*]

any good formula of the religion professed by *Luther* and his friends, from which might be learned clearly what were their views on religious subjects, and what the grounds of their opposition to the Roman pontiffs; and as the approaching solemn investigation of the whole subject, rendered such a paper exceedingly necessary, *John* the elector of Saxony directed *Luther* and some other of the most eminent doctors, to draw up a brief summary of the doctrines of the reformed religion. *Luther* conceived that the seventeen articles agreed to in the convention at Schwabach, in the year 1529, were sufficient; and accordingly he exhibited them to the elector at *Torgau;* whence they were called the *Articles of Torgau.*(54) From these articles as the basis, *Philip Melancthon,* by order and authority of the princes, drew up and put into more free and agreeable language, partly at Coburg and partly at Augsburg, holding consultation all the while with *Luther,* that confession of faith which is called the *Augsburg Confession.*

§ 29. During these transactions, there was scarcely any part of Europe, on which the light of the religious reformation by Luther did not shed its radiance, and likewise animate with the hope of regaining its liberty. Some of the more important countries, also, had now openly rejected the Romish institutions and prescriptions. The Romish bishop therefore had sufficient reason, to represent to the emperor the necessity of hastening the destruction of the factious people, and to fear the overthrow of his whole empire. Not long after the commencement of *Luther's* attack upon the Romish church, *Olaus Petri* a disciple of *Luther,* first imbued the Swedes with a knowledge of the truth. His efforts were nobly seconded by *Gustavus Vasa,* whom the Swedes, after expelling *Christiern* king of Denmark, had created king [A.D. 1523–1561], and who was a heroic prince, and very zealous for the public good. He had been in exile while *Christiern* was laying waste his country, and had acquired at Lubec some knowledge of the Lutheran religion, which he considered not only as the true religion of the scriptures, but also as salutary for Sweden in its present state. That he might not appear to do any thing rashly, while the minds of the people were distracted between the old religion and the new, and not to depart from the principles of the Lutheran religion, he determined to proceed gradually and with caution. He therefore first invited learned men from Germany who were competent teachers, and directed them to instruct the people in a knowledge of the Bible; and he caused the holy scriptures as translated by *Olaus Petri,* to be published and disseminated. He next, in the year 1526, directed this translator of the Swedish Bible, to hold a public discussion on religious subjects at Upsal, with *Peter Gallius,* a strenuous defender of popery. And *Gallius* being vanquished in the discussion, he at length in the assembly of the states at Westeras, A.D. 1527, so powerfully and judiciously recommended the reformed religion of Luther to the representatives of the nation, that, after long discussions and strenuous opposition from the bishops, it was harmoniously decreed, that the reformed religion should be introduced. This decision was the effect especially, of the firmness and resolution of the king; who

(54) See *Christ. August. Heumann's* Diss. de lenitate Augustanæ Confess. in the Sylloge Dissert. Theologicar., tom. i., p. 14, &c. *Jo. Joach. Müller's* Historia Protestationis; and most of the historians of the reformation and of the Augsburg Confession. [For instance, *Jo. Geo. Walch's* Introductio in Libros Eccles. Luth. symbolicos, lib. i., c. iii., § 2–9.—*Tr.*]

declared publicly, that he would rather resign his crown and retire from the kingdom, than rule over a people subjected to the laws and the authority of the Roman pontiff, and more obedient to their bishops than to their king.(55) From this time onward therefore, the whole power of the Roman pontiffs among the Swedes was entirely prostrate.

§ 30. *Christian* II., commonly called *Christiern*, king of Denmark [A.D. 1513–1523], who was, either from natural temperament or from the influence of bad counsels, an oppressive and cruel monarch, endeavoured to imbue the Danes with a knowledge of the Lutheran religion as early as the year 1521. For he first invited *Martin Reynhard*, a disciple of *Carolostadt*, from Saxony in the year 1520, and made him professor of theology at Copenhagen; and on his leaving the kingdom in 1521, he invited *Carolostadt* himself to Denmark; who however soon returned to Germany. The king even invited *Luther* to come to Denmark, but without success; and he adopted other measures, calculated to subvert the authority of the Roman pontiff in his territories. But in all this, *Christiern* was not actuated by zeal for true religion, but by the desire of increasing his own power and grandeur. At least, it seems evident from his conduct, that he patronised the Lutheran religion in order to obtain by it absolute dominion, and to wrest from the bishops their possessions and their power.(56) But his projects were unsuccessful. For the different orders of the realm conspired against him in 1523, and deposed and banished him from the kingdom, on account of his various acts of cruelty and oppression, and particularly for his attempts to destroy the liberties of Denmark and to abolish the established religion.(57) In place of him, *Frederic* duke of Holstein and *Sleswick*, uncle to *Christiern*, was called to the throne.

§ 31. This *Frederic* the successor of *Christiern*, [A.D. 1523–1533], proceeded with more prudence and moderation. He permitted *George*

(55) *Jo. Baaz*, Inventarium Eccl. Sueo-Gothorum, Lincoping, 1642, 4to. *Abrah. Scultetus*, Annales Evangelii renovati; in *Herm. von der Hardt's* Historia litter. Reformat., pars v., p. 83 and 110, &c. *Raynal's* Anecdotes Histor. politiques militaires, tom. i., pt. ii., p. 1, &c., and others. [*Dan. Gerdes*, Historia Evang. renovati, tom. iii., p. 277, &c. *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. ii., p. 3, &c.—*Tr.*]

(56) See *Jo. Gramm's* Diss. de Reformatione Daniæ a Christierno tentata; in tom. iii. Scriptor. Societ. scientiar. Hafniensis, p. 1–90.

(57) See the causes which induced the states of Denmark to renounce subjection to king Christiern, in *Jo. Pet. a Ludewig's* Reliquiæ Manuscriptor., tom. v., p. 315, &c., where those states thus express themselves, p. 321: Lutheranæ hæresis pullulatores contra jus pietatemque, in regnum nostrum Catholicum introduxit, Doctorem *Carolostadium.* fortissimum *Lutheri* athletam, enutrivit. [The grounds of the reformation were much the same in Denmark, as in Sweden. The interests of the state demanded a depression of the clergy. Denmark was an elective monarchy; and the power of the kings was greatly limited by the council of the state, which consisted partly of clergymen, and partly of civilians. The civil counsellors were from the highest nobility; the clerical were archbishops and bishops. The revenues of the kings were small; and the clergy were in possession of the most important castles and fortresses. Hence there was constant jealousy between the nobility and the clergy; and the former wished to see the latter humbled. *Christiern* so dexterously availed himself of this jealousy, that by it he stripped the clergy of their power, and introduced the reformation into the kingdom. He forcibly took from the papal preacher of indulgences, *Arcimbold*, a large sum of money, collected by the sale of indulgences; and he caused a Danish translation of the New Testament to be made. After his deposition, he heard *Luther* preach in Germany, with great pleasure; yet as he was hoping for succour from *Charles* V., he did not openly profess the Lutheran doctrines. But his queen *Isabella*, sister to the emperor *Charles* V., professed it, and died in it, with great constancy, in the year 1525.—*Schl.*]

Johnson (*Johannis*), *Jo. Tausan*, and others publicly to preach in the realm the doctrines they had learned from *Luther*:(58) but he did not venture to change the ancient government and constitution of the church. He moreover greatly aided the progress of the reformed religion, by procuring a decree of the senate, at the diet of Odensee A.D. 1527, by which the citizens were left at liberty either to continue in the old religion or to embrace the new, as they saw fit. For under the protection of this decree, the preachers of the reformed religion discharged their functions with so much success, that the greatest part of the Danes at length abandoned the Roman pontiff. Yet the glory of delivering Denmark altogether from the Roman bondage, was reserved for *Christian* III. [A.D. 1534–1559], a king of distinguished piety and prudence. For he, after stripping the bishops of their odious power, and restoring to their rightful owners a great part of the possessions which the church had got into her hands by base arts, called *John Bugenhagius* from Wittemberg, and with his aid, regulated the religious affairs of the whole realm, in an enlightened and judicious manner; and then in the assembly of the states at Odensee, in 1539, persuaded the chiefs of the nation to sanction the begun reformation in religion.(59)

§ 32. In regard to the reformation however, both in Sweden and Denmark, we should carefully discriminate between a reformation or change of *religion*, and a reformation of the *bishops*: two things, nearly related indeed, yet so distinct that either may exist without the other. For the religion of a people might be reformed, while the rank and power of the bishops remained the same; and on the other hand, the bishops might be deprived of a portion of their wealth and authority, and yet the old religion be retained. In the reformation of religion and worship, [in these countries], there was nothing that deserved censure; for no violence or imposition was practised, but every thing was done in a reasonable and religious manner. But in the reformation of the bishops and clergy, there appears to have been something defective. For violent measures were adopted; and the bishops, against their wills and their efforts to the contrary, were deprived of their honours, their prerogatives, and their possessions. Yet this reformation of the *clergy* in both those northern kingdoms, was not a religious, but a mere civil and secular transaction; and it was so necessary, that it must have been undertaken, if no *Luther* had arisen. For the bishops had by corrupt artifices got possession of so much wealth, so many castles, such revenues, and so great authority, that they were far more powerful than the kings, and were able to govern the whole realm at their pleasure; indeed they had appropriated to themselves a large portion of the patrimony of the kings, and of the public revenues. Such therefore was the state both of the Danish and the Swedish commonwealths

(58) See *Jo. Mölleri* Cimbria litterata, tom. ii, p. 886, &c. *Christ. Olvarius*, Vita Pauli Eliæ, p. 108, &c. *Eric Pontoppidan's* Annales eccles. Danicæ, tom. iii., p. 139, &c.

(59) *Eric Pontoppidan's* Concise History of the Reformation in Denmark, written in Danish, Lubec, 1734, 8vo, and his Annales ecclesiæ Danicæ, tom. ii., p. 790, &c., tom. iii., p. 1, &c. *Henry Muhlius*, de Reformat. religionis in vicinis Daniæ regionibus et potissimum in Cimbria; in his Dissert. Historico-Theologicæ, p. 24, &c., Kiliæ, 1715, 4to. [Also *Dan. Gerdes*, Historia Evangelii renovati, tom. iii., p. 338, &c. *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. ii, p. 59, &c. A still better account may be expected in the Ecclesiastical History of Denmark, now preparing, and partially published, by *Fr. Munter*, bishop of Seeland.—*Tr.*]

in the time of *Luther*, that either the bishops, who shamefully abused their riches, their prerogatives, and their honours, must be divested of the high rank they held in the state, and be deprived of a large portion of their ill-gotten wealth; or the ruin of those kingdoms, the irreparable detriment of the public safety and tranquillity, and the sinking of their kings into contempt, with an utter inability to protect the people, must be anticipated.

§ 33. In France, *Margaret* [born 1492, died 1549] queen of Navarre, and sister to *Francis* I. king of France, the perpetual enemy and rival of *Charles* V., was pleased with the principles of the reformed religion: and hence several pious men, well acquainted with the scriptures and sustained by her protection, ventured to teach this religion and to form religious societies, in one place and another. It appears from documents of unquestionable authority, that as early as the year 1523, there were in most of the provinces of France, a multitude of persons opposed to the principles and the laws of the Romish church; and among them were men of high character, and also prelates. As this number continually increased, and as religious commotions took place here and there, the king and the magistrates protected the ancient religion by the sword, and by penal inflictions, and a large number of pious and good persons were cruelly put to death.(60) But this cruelty advanced, rather than retarded, the progress of

(60) See *Theod. Beza's* Histoire des Eglises Reformées de France, tome i., livre i., p. 5, &c. *Elias Benoist's* Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes, tom. i., livre i., p. 6, &c. *Christ. Aug. Salig's* Historie der Augsburgischen Confession, vol. ii., p. 190, &c, and others. [*Gerdes*, Historia Evangelii renovati, tom. iv., p. 1, &c. *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reformat., vol. ii., p. 208, &c.—France was the first country, where the reformation that commenced in Germany and Switzerland, very soon and under the severest oppressions, found many adherents. No country seems to have been so long and so well prepared for it, as this: and yet here it met the most violent opposition; and no where was it later, before it obtained legal toleration. No where did it occasion such streams of blood to flow; no where give birth to such dreadful and deadly civil wars. And no where have state policy, court intrigue, political parties, and the ambition of greatness, had so powerful an influence on the progress and fortunes of the reformation, as in France.—*Schroeckh.* The friendship of *Francis* I. to the sciences, and his attachment and generosity to learned men, induced many persons of genius who were favourable to the reformation, to take up their residence in France; and thus the writings of the Reformers, which were in general better compositions than the books of the papists, were introduced extensively into France, and were there eagerly read; and by these writings such as had before taken no part in the religious contests, were convinced of the necessity of a reformation, and brought to desire it. The university of Paris indeed had already in 1521, declared expressly against *Luther* and his writings. (See the Determinatio Facultat. Theol. Paris. super doctrina Lutherana; in *Gerdes*, Historia Evangel. renovati, tom. iv., Append. No. ii., p. 10, 11.) Yet the doctrine of *Luther* and *Melancthon*, from the first, had many friends in France; indeed, there was a time when *Francis* I., to gratify the wishes of his sister, Queen *Margaret*, was disposed to invite *Melancthon* to take residence in France. The first movement with a direct view to produce a reformation, was at Meaux, where the devout and learned bishop *William Brissonet*, gave support and protection to *James le Fevre*, *William Farrell*, and *Gerard Roussel*, and permitted them openly to preach against the old superstitions and abuses of the Romish church, and to gather a small congregation. But as soon as the thing became extensively known, the parliament in the year 1533, ordered a rigorous investigation of the subject. *John le Clerc*, a woollen-spinner, but who had become a preacher to the new congregation at Meaux, published in this year a letter against indulgences, in which the pope was represented as Antichrist. He was therefore beaten with rods, branded with a hot iron, and banished; and afterwards, died a martyr at Metz. The congregation were dispersed all over France. *Brissonet*, terrified by the resentment of the king, drew back; and now condemned the doctrines he had hitherto approved. *Farrell* went to Switzerland, reformed Mümpelgard, and adhered firmly to

the new religion. The friends of reformation however in France, experienced various fortune, sometimes adverse, and sometimes tolerable, during the reign of *Francis* I. [A.D. 1515–1547]. For the king, being either of no religion or of a dubious one, conducted towards them just as his own advantage or state policy seemed to require. When he wished to conciliate the good-will of the German Protestants, and by them inflict a wound upon his enemy *Charles* V., he was mild, humane, and equitable towards them; but on a change of circumstances, he assumed a different character, and showed himself implacable towards them.

§ 34. The other countries of Europe did not exhibit so many and so clear indications of a defection from the Romish institutions and customs, prior to the presentation of the Confession of Augsburg. And yet it can be proved by the most credible testimonies, that Spain,(61) Hungary,(62)

the reformed doctrines till his death. *Le Fevre* and *Roussel* betook themselves to Navarre, to Queen *Margaret*, where they did not indeed openly break with the Romish church, yet greatly promoted the spread of pure doctrine. In the mean time, the evangelical multiplied exceedingly in Bearn and Guienne, through the protection of *Margaret*. *Francis* therefore, being prompted by the bishops, sent for this queen, and rebuked her for suffering these innovations to take place. She promised him, she would go no farther in this thing, provided the following concessions were granted her: 1st, That no mass should be said, unless there were persons to receive the eucharist. 2d, That the elevation of the host should cease. 3d, The worship of it also. 4th, That the eucharist should be administered in both kinds. 5th, That in the mass, there should be no mention made of *Mary* and the saints. 6th, That common, ordinary bread should be taken, broken, and distributed. And 7th, That the priests should not be compelled to a life of celibacy. But these propositions were rejected; and the preachers she had brought with her to Paris were thrown into prison, and with great difficulty, at her intercession, set at liberty. At last, cardinal *Tournon* so far wrought upon the king, by his fierce persecuting zeal, that he strictly commanded his sister to avoid all innovations in religious matters; and, notwithstanding the intercession of the Protestant princes of Germany, he caused the evangelical to be punished in the most cruel manner. Gallowses were erected, and the flames kindled, against the professors of the reformed doctrine: and yet they were so far from being exterminated, that their number increased continually. The persecution became still heavier in the year 1534, when some inconsiderate persons, in their rash zeal, posted up satirical papers against the popish mass in various places, and even on the royal palace. The blood of the unhappy Protestants now smoked, till the death of the king. Especially the honest Waldensians in the mountains of Provence, at Merindoles and Cabriers, became the victims of a most cruel persecution. Merindoles was destroyed; and its inhabitants, who had chiefly taken refuge at Cabriers, were either butchered or burned alive, or sent to the galleys. Cardinal *Tournon* was the instigator, and *Oppeda* the president of the parliament of Aix, was the chief actor in the bloody scene. Yet all was done with the consent of the king; though, in the end, he could not approve of all that had taken place, but execrated this worse than barbarian deed; and on his deathbed, enjoined upon his successor to subject it to an investigation.—*Schl.*]

(61) [The emperor *Charles* V. being king of Spain, and carrying on extensive wars in Italy, Germany, and Spain, his Spanish and German subjects of all ranks and professions, were necessarily brought into close contact. Many Spanish officers and soldiers and also statesmen and theologians, of course learned something of the reformed religion; and not a few of them embraced it. Yet the rigours of the Inquisition, and the complete ascendency of popery in Spain, induced the evangelical Spaniards for a long time either to conceal their religious sentiments, or to propagate them in the most covert manner. Yet before the year 1550, the Protestants had become so numerous in Spain that they ventured to appear openly. They could number a great many persons of distinction, and had increased so rapidly that it seemed as if the whole nation would soon embrace the reformed religion. But the Catholics taking the alarm, a most violent persecution ensued, which raged till not a heretic dared to show his head in that country. See *Michael Geddes*, Martyrology of Protestants in Spain: in his Miscellaneous Tracts, vol i., p. 545, &c., and Latin, in *Mosheim's* Dissert. Hist. Eccles., vol. i., p. 663, &c. *Reginaldi Gonsalvi* Relatio de Martyribus Protestantium in Hispan-

Bohemia,(63) Britain,(64) Poland,(65) and the Netherlands,(66) now abounded in great numbers of friends to the doctrines inculcated by *Lu-*

ia; in *Dan. Gerdes's* Miscellanea Groning., tom. iv., p. 681, &c., and *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. ii., p. 791, &c.—*Tr.*]

(62) [Hungary is one of the countries which early received some light from the Reformation, but in which it was resisted so strenuously, that it never absolutely triumphed, and never became the religion of the state. As early as 1522, several Hungarians educated at Wittemberg, introduced the Lutheran doctrines into their native country. These doctrines spread rapidly; and other Hungarians, trained in the school of Luther, became successful preachers to their countrymen. But persecution commenced in 1525, and was renewed from time to time, with such success as nearly to destroy the reformed churches. There were some Moravians or Hussites in the country, before the times of *Luther*, and likewise some Waldensians. *Mary*, widow of *Lewis* II. and sister to *Charles* V., was friendly to the Lutherans; and she checked the persecuting zeal of king Ferdinand, who was her brother. In the year 1530, five free cities in the northern part of Hungary, declared for Lutheranism, and presented a confession of their faith to the king. The next year *Matthias Devay*, the *Luther* of Hungary, began his career. The most rapid increase of the Reformed, was about the year 1550. In the year 1555, the five above-named free cities, and also twelve market-towns in the county of Zipf, with a few a towns in lower Hungary, and several noblemen, obtained liberty to practise the reformed religion. See *Schroeckh*, l. c., vol. ii., p. 723, &c.—*Tr.*]

(63) [As early as the year 1519, the Hussites in Bohemia opened a friendly correspondence with *Martin Luther*, and exhorted him to persevere in the good work, assuring him there were very many in Bohemia who prayed night and day for the success of his cause. (*Luther's* Lat. Works, ed. Jena, tom. i., p. 366, &c.) The intercourse continued free, and was salutary both to the Bohemians and the Lutherans, till the year 1525, when it was suspended for ten years, in consequence of some slanderous reports respecting *Luther* propagated in Bohemia. But in 1535, the intercourse was renewed; evangelical doctrines spread in the country; and the Hussites corrected their former creed, without entirely abandoning it. The evangelical were divided among themselves, and were exposed to persecution: yet they multiplied greatly, and finally obtained free toleration. See *Adr. Regenvolscii* Systema Historiæ Chronolog. Ecclesiar. Slavonicar., cap. ix., p. 54, &c., and *Jo. Th. Elsner's* Brevis conspectus doctrinæ Fratrum Bœmorum; in *Gerdes*, Miscellanea Groning., tom. vi., pt. i., p. 381, &c. —*Tr.*]

(64) [In England, the Wickliffites, though obliged to keep concealed, had not been exterminated by 150 years' persecution. *Luther's* writings were early brought into England, and there read with avidity. This quickened persecution; and six men and one woman were burned at the stake in Coventry, on Passion Week, A.D. 1519. In 1522, king *Henry* VIII. wrote a confutation of *Luther's* doctrines; but to no purpose. *Bilney*, *Latimer*, and others at Cambridge, formed a society, which read and circulated *Luther's* books, as early as 1523. *William Tindal* made an English translation of the New Testament, which he printed at Antwerp, and circulated in England in 1526. The next year, king *Henry* began to question the legality of his marriage with his brother's widow, and proceeded to solicit from the pope a divorce. The negotiation was protracted till the king was out of all patience, and he proceeded without the pope's consent to divorce his queen. The pope censured his conduct, and a quarrel ensued, the result of which was, that *Henry*, with the consent of the parliament, abolished the papal authority in England, A.D. 1533. During this period, though persecution had been kept up, the number of the Reformed had greatly increased, and the nation was ripe for a secession from Rome. See *Burnet's* History of the Reformation, book i., ii., *Gerdes'* Historia Evang. renovati, tom. iv., p. 172, &c. *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit d. Ref., vol. ii., p. 505, &c.—Through England, some of the writings of the early reformers might reach Scotland, then sunk in ignorance, superstitiously devoted to its priests, and still more passionately attached to its nobles the heads of the Scottish clans. *Patrick Hamilton*, a young nobleman, and abbot of Ferme, eager to know more of the Reformed religion, went to Germany, and studied some time at Marpurg. Returning with one of his three companions to Scotland, he began to preach the doctrines of the Reformers. The priests arraigned him for heresy, convicted him, and he was burned alive at St. Andrews, A.D. 1527, in the 24th year of his age. From this time the Protestant doctrines made a slow but constant progress, amid ever wakeful persecution, in Scotland, till the

ther; some of whom repaired to Wittemberg, for the sake of enjoying the instructions of so great a master and guide. Some of these countries, afterwards, made themselves wholly free from the Romish yoke; in others, numerous congregations arose, that rejected the decrees of the pontiff, and which have existed down to the present times, though amid various molestations; in others, the most cruel persecutions and inhuman laws, after a short time, extinguished the knowledge that had been obtained and widely circulated of the reformed religion. It may be unhesitatingly asserted,—for the adherents of the Roman pontiffs themselves admit it,—that the entire fabric of the Romish church would have been quickly demolished, had not its defenders opposed the multitude of assailants, already in the breach, with fire and sword.

year 1547, when the famous Scottish reformer, *John Knox*, arose. See *Schroeckh*, l. c., p. 435, &c. *Robertson's* History of Scotland, b. ii.; *Gerdes'* Hist. Evang. renovati, vol. iv., p. 210, &c., 229, 234, 291, &c., 304, &c., 321.—*Tr.*]

(65) [Before the Reformation, a considerable body of Hussites had removed from Bohemia to Poland; where their doctrines spread considerably, especially among the nobility, and roused the spirit of persecution. *Luther's* writings at once circulated among the dissenters from the church of Rome, corrected their views, and strengthened their opposition to popery. Even some of the bishops favoured evangelical doctrines; and as early as 1525, there were several evangelical preachers in Poland, and also in Polish Prussia. But so vigorous a persecution was kept up, that Protestant worship could be maintained only in private, till near the middle of the century. See *Regenvolscii* Systema Hist. Chronol. Ecclesiar. Slavonicar. lib. i., c. 13, p. 71, &c. *Schroeckh*, l. c., vol. ii., p. 666, &c.—*Tr.*]

(66) [The seventeen Belgian provinces, composing the Netherlands, were a part of the hereditary dominions of *Charles* V., which he governed by his viceroys. Here, from the 14th century, various religious reformers had appeared, as *Gerhard Groot*, *John Wessclius*, *Thomas à Kempis*, *John of Goch*, and *Cornelius Grapheus*. Here also arose the famous *Erasmus*. The writings of *Luther* were early and eagerly read by the Netherlanders. The Catholics were alarmed; and through their instigation, the government introduced the Inquisition in the year 1522, and kept up a hot persecution of the Reformed for a long course of years. It was computed, that in these provinces, during the reign of *Charles* V., not less than 50,000 persons lost their lives, in consequence of their defection from the church of Rome. Yet the number of the Reformed continually increased; and when at length, seven of these provinces revolted, and became an independent state, they adopted the Protestant religion. See *Gerdes*, Hist. Evang. renovati, tom. iii., p. 1, &c. *Schroeckh*, l. c., vol. ii., p. 348, &c.—*Tr.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION, FROM THE PRESENTATION OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION [1530], TILL THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE WAR OF SMALCALD [1546].

§ 1. The Augsburg Confession presented to the Emperor.—§ 2. Its Character.—§ 3. Confutation of it.—§ 4. Deliberations for settling the Religious Controversies.—§ 5. Result of the Diet of Augsburg.—§ 6. The League of Smalcald.—§ 7. The Peace of Nuremberg.—§ 8, 9. The Council.—§ 10. Commotion of the Anabaptists.—§ 11. Revolt of Great Britain from the Pontiff.—§ 12. Character of this Reformation.—§ 13. Renewed Attempts at Compromise. The Conference at Worms. The Diet of Ratisbon.—§ 14. Preparations for War.

§ 1. CHARLES V. made his entry into Augsburg on the 15th of June [1530], and on the 20th of the same month the diet was opened. As the members had agreed that the religious affairs should be despatched before discussing the subject of a Turkish war, the Protestant members present, received permission from the emperor to exhibit a summary view of the religion they professed, in the session of the princes on the 25th of June. Accordingly in the palace of the bishop of Augsburg, that confession of faith, which from the place where it was exhibited was called the Augsburg Confession, was read in German, by *Christian Bayer* the chancellor of Saxony. There was not one of the princes that did not listen to it with eager attention; and some of them, who before did not correctly understand the religious views of *Luther*, expressed approbation of the purity and innocence of the doctrines. *John* elector of Saxony, and four princes of the empire, *George* marquis of Brandenburg, *Ernest* duke of Luneburg, *Philip* landgrave of Hesse, and *Wolfgang* prince of Anhalt, with the two imperial cities, *Nuremberg* and *Reutlingen*, subscribed their names to the copies [the one Latin the other German] delivered after the reading to the emperor, in testimony of the accordance of the doctrines there expressed with their own views.(1)

§ 2. As the Augsburg Confession was adopted as a public standard of faith, by the whole body of [Lutheran] Protestants, no one of them should be ignorant of its character and contents. The style is *Philip Melanc-*

(1) [A history of this *diet*, in a large folio volume, by *George Cœlestine*, [a Lutheran], was published at Frankfort on the Oder, in 1577. Histories of the Augsburg *Confession*, were composed by *David Chytræus*, and by others; and especially in the 18th century, by *Ern. Salomon Cyprian*, and by *August. Salig*, in the German language. *Salig's* work is prolix, and is more properly a history of the *reformation*, than a history of the *Augsburg Confession*. *Cyprian's* history is more concise and dense, and is corroborated with well-selected documents. It therefore deserves to pass to a third edition. [*G. G. Webber's* critical History of the Augsburg Confession, Frankf. on Mayne, 1783, &c., 2 vols. 8vo.—The original subscribers to the confession are mentioned in the text. Before the diet rose, the cities, *Kempten*, *Heilbronn*, *Windsheim*, and *Weissenburg*, also subscribed; and afterwards, many more. It was immediately printed, and soon spread all over Europe, and was translated into various foreign languages. It thus became of great service to the Protestant cause; for it was a very able document, and was drawn up in a most judicious manner. See *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. i., p. 445, &c.—*Tr.*]

thon's; which is as much as to say, it was drawn up in polished, perspicuous language, well adapted to the subject. The contents or matter, it is certain, was supplied principally by *Luther;* who was at Coburg, a town not far from Augsburg, at the time of the diet; and who examined and approved the form and style which *Melancthon* gave to it. It was comprised in twenty-eight articles; of which twenty-one stated distinctly, the religious faith of those that had receded from the church of Rome; and the other seven recounted the errors or *abuses* as they were called, on account of which they had separated from the Romish community.(2)

(2) [The articles in this Confession, or as it might be called *Apology*, are of very unequal length. Some are in the form of answers to slanders against the Lutherans; others are short essays; most of them include proofs or argumentation; and several of them are followed by renunciations of the opposite tenets held by heretics ancient or modern. As few American readers have access to this celebrated creed, the following summary of its contents is here subjoined.

Art. 1st treats of God and the Trinity; in accordance with the Nicene Creed.

Art. 2d affirms that all men, since the fall, are born with sin; that is, destitute of faith and the fear of God, and with corrupt propensities; for which hereditary sin they are exposed to eternal death, until they are regenerated by baptism and the Holy Spirit. It rejects the *Pelagian* doctrine, and denies man's ability to obtain justification by his own works.

Art. 3d treats of the person and mediation of Christ; in accordance with the Apostles' Creed.

Art 4th asserts justification to be, solely, on the ground of Christ's righteousness imputed to the believer, and not on the ground of his personal righteousness; agreeably to Rom., ch. iii., iv.

Art. 5th asserts, that the word, preaching, and the sacraments, are the medium through which God imparts the Holy Spirit to whom he will; in consequence of which, they believe unto righteousness. It rejects the doctrine of the Anabaptists, that men can obtain the Holy Spirit by their own efforts, and without the means above stated.

Art. 6th asserts, that true faith always produces good works; which every man is bound to perform, yet must not rely upon them for salvation.

Art. 7th affirms the existence of a holy catholic church, consisting of all the faithful; and which is known, not by a uniformity in ceremonies, but by the efficacious preaching of the word, and the administration of the sacraments in their purity.

Art. 8th asserts, that the Christian church, though composed of saints, yet has hypocrites in it; and that the efficacy of the sacraments is not destroyed by hypocrisy in the administrators.

Art. 9th asserts, that baptism is necessary, and is a means of grace; and that infants are to be baptized.

Art. 10th asserts, that the real body and blood of Christ are truly present in the eucharist, under the elements of the bread and wine, and are distributed and received.

Art. 11th retains private confession of sins to the pastors, and absolution by them; but denies the necessity of a particular enumeration of all sins.

Art. 12th maintains, that those who sin after baptism, if they repent, should always be restored by the church: that repentance consists in sorrow and regret for sin and reliance on Christ for pardon, and is productive of good works. It denies sinless perfection in this life, the Novatian error of refusing absolution to the penitent, and all dependance on our own satisfactions for sin.

Art. 13th asserts, that the sacraments are not merely significant signs, but are tokens and evidence of God's gracious disposition towards us, calculated to awaken and strengthen our faith, and requiring faith to a worthy receiving of them.

Art. 14th asserts, that no one should preach publicly, and administer the sacraments, unless duly called.

Art. 15th. Rites of human institution, so far as they are not sinful, and tend to peace and good order in the church, (as certain feasts, fasts, &c.), are to be observed. But all human institutions, designed to appease God, are contrary to the Gospel.

Art. 16th. Civil government is ordained of God; and Christians may lawfully hold offices, civil and military, and may pursue the various occupations of citizens: contrary to the views of the *Anabaptists*, and such as deem all worldly business inconsistent with a truly religious life.

Art. 17th asserts, that, at the last day, Christ will come, will raise the dead, and will adjudge the believing and elect to eternal life, and wicked men and devils to hell and eternal torment. It rejects the An-

§ 3. The friends of the pontiff present at the diet, drew up a *confutation* of the *Protestant Confession;* of which, *John Faber*, afterwards bishop of Vi-

abaptist notion of a final restoration of devils and the damned; and also the Jewish notion of a temporal reign of Christ on the earth, prior to the resurrection.

Art. 18th asserts, that men have some free will to live reputably, to choose among objects which their natural reason can comprehend; but that without the gracious aids of the Holy Spirit, they cannot please God, nor truly fear him, exercise faith, or overcome their sinful propensities, 1 Cor. ii.

Art. 19th asserts, that God is not the cause and author of sin; but that the perverse wills of ungodly men and devils, are the sole cause of it.

Art. 20th maintains, that the Reformers do not discourage good works, though they inculcate the doctrine of justification by faith alone; but only discourage useless works, as the rosary, worshipping saints, pilgrimages, monastic vows, stated fasts, &c.; and it evinces, at considerable length, from scripture and the fathers, that a man cannot be justified by works.

Art. 21st admits, that the saints are to be respected, and to be imitated as patterns of piety; but denies, that they are to be worshipped, prayed to, or regarded as mediators.

Such for substance (say they) is the doctrine taught in our churches; and being the doctrine of the Bible, we cannot but hold to it. All should embrace it.

The *abuses* (they say) which have crept into the church, and which we could not conscientiously endure, are chiefly the following.

Art. 22d. Denying the *sacramental cup* to the laity; contrary to scripture and early Christian practice.

Art. 23d. Imposing *celibacy on the clergy;* contrary to reason, and scripture, and the practice of the purer ages, and with very injurious consequences.

Art. 24th. The Protestants are falsely taxed with abolishing the *mass*. They only purified it; and discarded the idea of its being a work of merit, an offering for the sins of the living and the dead, which militates with the scriptural doctrine that Christ's sacrifice is the only sin-offering.

Art. 25th. The Protestants had not abolished *private confession;* for they made it a necessary preparation for the eucharist. Yet they did not consider it a sacrament, nor require a particular enumeration of sins.

Art. 26th censures the multitude of *fasts and other ceremonies* of human invention, and the undue stress laid upon them, as meritorious acts; thus obscuring the doctrine of salvation by faith, holding these human prescriptions more sacred than the commands of God, and burdening the consciences of men with them.

Art. 27th represents the whole system of *monkery* as a great abuse, and exceedingly injurious to piety.

Art. 28th discriminates between *civil and ecclesiastical power*, and allows neither to infringe upon the other. The spiritual or episcopal power is limited to preaching, administering the sacraments, and loosing and binding sins. If bishops teach contrary to the scriptures, they are, and must be treated as, false prophets. If allowed to try causes relating to marriage and tithes, it is only as civil officers. They have no legislative power over the church; and they can bind the conscience, only by showing, that the gospel enjoins what they inculcate. As to Sundays and other holy days, and rites and forms of worship, bishops may and should appoint such as are convenient and suitable; and the people should observe them,—not as divine ordinances,—but as conducive to good order and edification.

Though the Lutherans expressed their doctrine of *consubstantiation* in the most inoffensive terms that would be explicit, yet the Reformed or Zwinglians could not subscribe to the Augsburg Confession. Hence the imperial cities of *Strasburg*, *Constance*, *Lindau*, and *Memmingen*, offered a separate confession, called the *Confession of the four cities*, Confessio Tetrapolitana. It agreed, substantially, with the Augsburg Confession, except in regard to the *corporeal presence*. They held to a *real*, yet a *spiritual* or sacramental presence; a presence which the devout soul could feel and enjoy, but which implied no physical presence of Christ's body. Yet they expressed themselves in terms which need not have given offence to the Lutherans. They say: "All that the evangelists, Paul, and the holy fathers, have written respecting the venerable sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, our preachers teach, recommend, and inculcate, with the greatest fidelity. Hence, with singular earnestness, they constantly proclaim that goodness of Christ towards his followers, whereby, no less now than at his last supper, to all his sincere disciples as oft as they repeat this supper, he condescends to give, by the sacraments, his real body and his real blood, to be truly eaten and drunken, *as the food and drink of their souls*, by which *they* are nourished to

enna, with the aid of *John Eckius* and *John Cochlæus*, is said to have been the composer. This confutation being likewise read before the diet on the 3d of August, the emperor required the Protestants to acquiesce in it, and to abandon their whole cause and controversy. But they declared themselves not satisfied with this answer of the papal divines; and wished to have a copy of it, that they might point out its fallacies. The emperor, more obedient to the exhortations of the pontiff's legate and his companions, than to the demands of right and of equity, refused their request, and would not allow the controversy to be protracted by any new writings about it. Nevertheless the Protestants caused an answer to be drawn up by *Philip Melancthon*, to so much of the pontificial confutation as the theologians had been able to gather from hearing it read; and on the 22d of September they presented it to the emperor, who refused to receive it. This answer (though afterwards corrected and enlarged by *Melancthon*, upon obtaining a copy of the pontifical confutation) is that *Apology for the Augsburg Confession*, which was afterwards published in the year 1531, and which constitutes a part of the symbolical books of the Lutheran church.(3)

§ 4. Three modes of getting rid of these very troublesome contentions, remained. One was, to allow those who would not obey the mandates of the pontiff, to enjoy their own sentiments on religion, and to worship God

eternal life; so that he lives and abides in them, and they in him." This confession they presented to the emperor, in Latin and German; but he would not allow it to be read in public. Yet when the popish priests had made out a confutation of it, he called them before him, to hear that confutation read; and then, without allowing discussion, or permitting them to have a copy of the confutation, demanded of them submission to the church of Rome. They refused. This confession of the four cities, which was drawn up by *Martin Bucer*, and had been adopted by the senate and people of Augsburg, was the confession of that city for a number of years. But afterwards, the four cities, feeling the necessity of a union with the Lutherans, lest their popish enemies should swallow them up, brought themselves to believe, that the Lutherans and they differed more in words, than in reality; and therefore they subscribed to the Augsburg confession, and became a part of the Lutheran church. See *Hospinian's* Historia Sacramentaria, pt. ii., p. 162, &c. At the same diet, *Zwingle* presented *his* private confession; which is a long and elaborate performance. He says; "Grace is conferred *along with* the sacraments; but not *by* them as the channels; or in other words, that the Holy Spirit imparts grace to the devout communicants, in the ordinance; but does not annex the grace to the sacrament, so that it may go along with it, as water through a channel, or by a physical process." And respecting the Lord's supper, he says; "I believe, that in the holy eucharist, or supper of thanksgiving, the real body of Christ is present, *to the eye of faith*, (fidei contemplatione); that is, to those who thank the Lord for the benefits conferred on us in Christ his Son, acknowledge that he assumed a real body, truly suffered in it, and washed away our sins in his own blood; and thus the whole that Christ has done is, as it were, present to the eye of their faith. But that the body of Christ, in substance, and reality, or that his natural body, is present in the supper, and is received into our mouth, and masticated by our teeth,—as the papists, and some who look back upon the fleshpots of Egypt, represent,—that I not only deny, but unhesitatingly pronounce an error, and contrary to the word of God." He subjoins elaborate proofs, from the scripture, reason, and the fathers, in support of these views. To this confession, *Eckius*, a Catholic divine replied; and *Zwingle*, on the 27th of August, defended himself, in a letter addressed to the emperor and to the Protestant princes. See *Hospinian*, l. c., p. 167, &c.—*Tr.*]

(3) [*Melancthon* composed the *Apology* in Latin: but afterwards, *Justus Jonas* translated it into German, in which language it was published in the first collection of all the symbolical books of the Lutheran church, Dresden, 1580, fol. 21–134. The Augsburg Confession in German, immediately precedes it, fol. 3–20. See *J. G. Walch's* Introductio in Libros symbolicos, l.b. i., cap. 4, p. 409, &c.—*Tr.*]

as they saw fit; without allowing the public tranquillity to be thereby destroyed. Another was, to compel them by force of arms, to cease from dissenting from the Romish church, and make them return to the spurned friendship of the Roman prelate. A third was, to attempt an honourable and equitable compromise, by each party's relinquishing some portion of what it considered as its just claims. The first method was accordant with reason and justice, and would meet the wishes of the wise and good; but it was totally repugnant to the arrogant claims of the pontiff, and to the ignorance of the age, which abhorred all liberty of opinion concerning religion. The second accorded with the customs and views of the age, and with the violent counsels of the Romish court; but it was abhorrent to the prudence, the moderation and the equity, both of the emperor, and of all good men. The third therefore was adopted, and met the approbation of all who were solicitous for the good of the empire; nor did the sovereign pontiff himself seem to be wholly averse from it. Hence various consultations were held, between select individuals of both parties; and every means was adopted, that seemed calculated to allay mutual hatred, and bring discordant minds to harmonize. But the parties were too wide apart in their first principles, for any thing to be effected. In these discussions, the character of *Philip Melancthon*, whom, as the principal doctor among the Protestants, the adherents to the pontiff took special pains to conciliate, very clearly appeared. He seemed easy of access, and ready to make concessions when his opposers dealt in compliments and promises; but when they would terrify him by threats and denunciations, he seemed quite another man, bold, courageous, and regardless of life and fortune. For in this great man, a mild and tender spirit was united with the strictest fidelity and an invincible attachment to what he regarded as the truth.

§ 5. This mode of settling the religious controversies having been tried for a sufficient length of time,(4) it was concluded to resort to the method so repugnant to reason and to the principles of Christianity, but which the perverseness of the times recommended. Accordingly on the 19th of November, a severe decree was passed by command and authority of the emperor, in the absence of the two leaders of the Protestants, the landgrave of Hesse and the elector of Saxony; in which there was nothing that could solace the Protestants, except an equivocal and deceptive promise of a council to be called within six months by order of the pontiff. For the dignity and excellence of the old religion were extolled extravagantly; new force was added to the edict of Worms, against *Luther* and his followers; the religious reformations, entered upon in one place and another, were severely censured; and the princes and the cities that had become alienated from the pontiff, were admonished to return to their duty within some months, unless they wished to incur the vengeance of the emperor, as the patron and protector of the church.(5)

§ 6. On learning the sad issue of the diet, the elector of Saxony and his associates, in the year 1530 and the year following, assembled at Smalcald and afterwards at Frankfort, and formed a league among themselves,

(4) [The conferences continued, with repeated changes of the delegates, from the second day of August, till the end of the month.—*Tr.*]

(5) See, in addition to the authors before mentioned, *Jo. Joach. Muller's* Historie der Protestation und Appellation der Evangelischen Stände, book iii., ch. 48, p. 997.

for their mutual protection against the evils which the edict of Augsburg portended, but excluding all offensive operations against any one.(6) They also took measures to bring the kings of France, England, and Denmark, as well as other princes and states, into the confederacy.(7) When things began to wear this warlike aspect, the electors of Mayence and the Palatinate interposed as mediators between the parties. And the emperor *Charles* V., for various reasons, was very anxious for peace. For the Protestants would not afford their aid to a Turkish war, which the emperor exceedingly needed; and they also contended, that *Ferdinand* the emperor's brother, who had been created king of the Romans by the major part of the princes in the diet of Cologne, A.D. 1531, had been elected contrary to the laws of the empire.

§ 7. After various consultations therefore, in the year 1532, a peace was concluded at Nuremberg between the emperor and the Protestants on

(6) [The first meeting of the Protestants subsequently to the diet, was held at Smalcald on the 22d of December, 1530. But it was found, that many of the representatives of cities had received no instruction, in regard to a confederacy; and that many other cities were to be invited to join them. As the emperor had entered into a coalition with the Catholic states, against them, they assembled again, in the following year on the 29th of March, to form a closer union for their mutual defence. The landgrave of Hesse took great pains to have the Swiss included in the confederacy. But the elector of Saxony, who was guided by *Luther*, absolutely refused to admit them. And in general, *Luther* had great scruples in regard to the whole transaction; and the jurists had much debate with him respecting the lawfulness of such a confederacy; for he, according to his monkish principles, held all human means for preserving peace in religious matters to be unallowable; and supposed, that men should repose themselves wholly on the providence of God, without venturing upon any measures suggested by policy in such cases. But the jurists informed him, that the constitution of the empire allowed the states to combine together, and probably also to declare war against the emperor; for by virtue of the compact between the emperor and the states, the emperor engaged not to infringe upon the laws of the empire, and the rights and liberties of the Germanic church. This compact the emperor had violated; and therefore the states had a right to combine together against him. *Luther* replied, that he had not been aware of this; and that if it was so, he had no objections to make; for the gospel was not opposed to civil government. Yet he could not approve of an *offensive* war.—*Schl.*]

(7) [In their meeting at Smalcald A.D. 1531, after forming a league for mutual defence for six years, they drew up an *apology* for their conduct; in which they gave a concise history of the reformation, the necessity there was for it, and the sufferings and dangers to which they were exposed on account of it. Copies of this apology they sent both to *Francis* I. the king of France, and to *Henry* VIII. of England. Both those kings returned very civil answers; but nothing was said, on either side, about an alliance for mutual defence. See *Seckendorf's* Historia Lutheranismi, lib. iii., § 1. *Gerdes*, Historia Evang. renovati, tom. iv., p. 222, &c. In 1535, the Protestants had another meeting at Smalcald, in which they extended their league of 1531, for 10 years longer. About this time, *Dr. Barns* an English bishop, arrived in Saxony, as envoy from the king of England; and he was soon followed by *Edward Fox* bishop of Hereford, and *Nicholas Heith* an English archdeacon. They attended the convention at Smalcald, and a negotiation was held for forming a coalition of some sort, between the German confederates and the king of England. See *Seckendorf*, l. c, lib. iii., § 39. In 1538, the German confederates sent an embassy to the king of France, (which however effected very little), and also three ambassadors to the king of England. They proposed to king *Henry*, to adopt the Augsburg Confession, and consent to be the head and patron of the Protestant confederacy; they also stated, what aid each should afford to the other in case of attack from the enemy. But *Henry* was not yet prepared to go so far in the Reformation; nor did he wish to embroil himself with the emperor. See *Seckendorf*, l. c., lib. iii., § 166, p. 197, &c. *Gerdes*, l. c., p. 287, &c. *Burnet's* History of the Reformation, book iii., vol. i., p. 329, &c., ed. Lond., 1825.—*Tr.*]

the following terms; that the latter should contribute money for the Turkish war, and should acknowledge *Ferdinand* as king of the Romans; and that *Charles* should annul the edicts of Worms and Augsburg, and should allow the followers of *Luther* full liberty to regulate their religious matters as they pleased, until either a council (which was to be held within six months) or a diet of the empire, should determine what religious principles were to be adopted and obeyed. Scarcely was the apprehension of war removed by this convention, when *John*, the elector of Saxony, died; and was succeeded by his son, *John Frederic*, an unfortunate prince, though possessed of invincible fortitude and magnanimity.

§ 8. The truce of Nuremberg with the emperor, gave so much courage and fortitude to the concealed and feebler enemies of the pontiff, that they would no longer obey his mandates. This is attested by various regions and towns of Germany, which year after year, from this time onward, fearlessly made profession of the religion which *Luther* had restored. Moreover, as the only hope of removing the disagreement about religion now depended on the promised council, the emperor did not cease to urge the sovereign pontiff *Clement* VII. to hasten the meeting of the council. But *Clement*, whom the recollection of former councils filled with apprehensions, contrived only to put it off, and wished the cause of his see might be decided rather by arms than by arguments.(8) He promised indeed by his legate, in 1533, that a council should be called in Italy; either at Mantua, Placentia, or Bologna. But the Protestants declared themselves not satisfied with an *Italian* council; and maintained that a controversy arising in Germany, ought to be decided within the limits of Germany. And the pontiff himself artfully so managed, as to get rid of his own promise; and soon after died, in the year 1534.(9)

§ 9. His successor, *Paul* III., seemed more tractable, when the emperor addressed him on the subject of a council. For he first made a promise in 1535, that he would assemble a council at Mantua; and afterwards, A.D. 1536, he actually proclaimed one, by letters despatched through all the Catholic countries. The Protestants on the other hand, foreseeing that in such a council every thing would go according to the opinion and the pleasure of the pontiff, declared, in a convention held at Smalcald in 1537, their entire dissatisfaction with such a servile council: yet they procured a new summary of their religious faith to be drawn up by *Luther*, which they might present to the assembled bishops, if occasion should call for it.

(8) [Besides the causes, which, since the councils of Constance and Basil, had divested the popes of all relish for such clerical parliaments, pope *Clement* had his own peculiar reasons. It was his misfortune to be the illegitimate son of *Julian* de Medicis; and he was afraid his enemies in the council might avail themselves of this circumstance, to pronounce him therefore unworthy of the papal dignity. For it was a disputed point, which had never been decided, whether a bastard could ever be a legitimate pope. That a *profligate* might be, had been decided by usage long since, especially by the example of *Alexander* VI. See *Paul Sarpi*, tom. i., p. 54, &c., and *Jac. Ziegler's* Historia Clementis VII., in *Schelhorn's* Amœnitat. hist. eccles. et litterar., vol. i., p. 210, &c.—*Schl.*]

(9) Every thing pertaining to this council, is fully and intelligently stated, pre-eminently by *Paul Sarpi*, Historia Concilii Tridentini, lib. i.—[The Protestants met at Smalcald, to consider the proposed plan of an Italian council; and remonstrated against it, as being to be held in Italy. They also insisted, that the pope, as one of the parties whose cause was to be tried, should have no authority over the council; and that the decision should be founded solely on the holy scriptures.—*Tr.*]

This writing of *Luther*, is called the *Articles of Smalcald;* and it was admitted among the books, from which the religious sentiments of those called Lutherans are to be learned.(10)

§ 10. During these consultations two very noticeable events occurred, the one very injurious to the general interests of religion and especially to the cause of the reformation, the other no less so, to the papal dominion. The former was, a new sedition of the furious and fanatical tribe of the *Anabaptists;* the latter was, a revolt of *Henry* VIII. the king of Great Britain, from the Roman pontiff. In the year 1533, certain persons of the class of *Anabaptists*, who were more insane and distracted than the rest, came to Munster a city of Westphalia, and gave out, that they were divinely commissioned to set up a sort of holy empire on the ruins of all human institutions. The whole city being wrought up and thrown into great commotion, they proceeded to erect the new commonwealth, conformably to their crude opinions and fancies; and placed *John Bockholt*, a taylor of Leyden, at the head of it. But the city being taken in the year 1535, by the bishop of Munster, who was aided by other German princes, this delirious king and his associates were executed without

(10) [The Articles of Smalcald were drawn up in German, by *Luther*, in his own acrimonious style. The Augsburg Confession was intended to soften prejudice against the Lutherans, and to conciliate the good will of the Catholics. Of course the gentle *Melancthon* was employed to write it. The Articles of Smalcald, on the contrary, were a preparation for a campaign against an enemy with whom no compromise was deemed possible, and in which victory or death was the only alternative. Of course all delicacy towards the Catholics was dispensed with, and *Luther's* fiery style was chosen, and was allowed full scope. In words, the Articles flatly contradict the Confession, in some instances; though in sense, they are the same. Thus the Confession (Article xxiv.) says; "We are unjustly charged with having abolished the *mass*. For it is manifest, that without boasting we may say, the mass is observed by us with greater devotion and earnestness, than by our opposers." But in the Articles of Smalcald, (Part II., Art. II.), it is said; "That the popish *mass* is the greatest and most horrid abomination, as militating directly and violently against these articles; and yet it has become the chief and most splendid of all the popish idolatries." In the Confession, they applied the name of *the mass* to the Lutheran form of the *eucharist*. But in these Articles, they confine that term to its proper import, the ordinary public service among the Catholics.—The Articles of Smalcald cover 28 folio pages; and are preceded by a preface, and followed by a treatise on the power and supremacy of the pope. The *first* part contains four concise articles, respecting God, the Trinity, and the incarnation, passion, and ascension of Christ; in accordance with the Apostles' and the Athanasian Creeds. On these Articles the Protestants professed to agree altogether with the papists. The *second* part, also, contains four articles of fundamental importance; but in which the Protestants and papists are declared to be totally and irreconcilably at variance. They relate to the nature and the grounds of *justification*, the *mass* and *saint worship*, ecclesiastical and monkish *establishments*, and the claims of the *pope*. The *third* part contains 15 articles, which the Protestants considered as relating to very important subjects, but on which the papists laid little stress. The subjects are *sin*, the *law*, *repentance*, the *gospel*, *baptism*, the *sacrament of the altar*, the *keys*, (*or spiritual power*), *confession*, *excommunication*, *ordination*, *celibacy of the clergy*, *churches*, *good works*, *monastic vows*, and human *satisfactions for sin*. When the Protestants subscribed these Articles, *Melancthon* annexed a reservation to his signature, purporting that he could admit of a *pope*, provided he would allow the gospel to be preached in its purity, and would give up his pretensions to a *divine right* to rule, and would found his claims wholly on expediency and human compact. In consequence of this dissent from *Luther*, *Melancthon* was requested to draw up an article on the power and supremacy of the pope. He did so; and the Protestants were well pleased with it, and subscribed to it. It is annexed to the Articles of Smalcald. See *J. G. Walch's* Introductio in Libros Symbol., lib. i., cap. v.—*Tr.*]

mercy; and the new republic was thus overthrown, soon after its establishment. This seditious procedure of certain *Anabaptists*, induced most of the princes of Europe to enact severe laws against the whole race; in consequence of which, in subsequent years vast numbers of them, both the innocent and the guilty, were miserably put to death.(11)

§ 11. *Henry* VIII. king of Great Britain, the same who had before warmly opposed *Luther*, a prince falling behind none of that age either in vice or in talents, being smitten with the charms of *Anne Boleyn* an English virgin of high birth, in order to marry her wished to be divorced from his queen, *Catharine* of Aragon aunt to *Charles* V., and he applied to the sovereign pontiff *Clement* VII. to sanction such a measure.(12) He declared however, that his conscience would not allow him to cohabit with his queen *Catharine*, because she had been married to his deceased brother *Arthur*, and a marriage with a brother's widow was contrary to the law of God. *Clement*, through fear of offending *Charles* V., contrived various evasions, and endeavoured to delude and disappoint *Henry*. He therefore became impatient, and at the suggestion of *Thomas Cranmer*, who was afterwards archbishop of Canterbury and a secret friend to the reformation by *Luther*, consulted nearly all the universities of Europe on the question; and as most of them pronounced marriage with a brother's widow to be unlawful, the king divorced *Catharine* without the consent of the pontiff, and married *Anne Boleyn*. *Henry's* defection from the pontiff soon followed. For the king being declared by the lords and commons of England, *supreme head of the British church*, he in the year 1533 ejected the monks, disposed of all their property, and abolished altogether the authority of the Roman pontiff in England.(13)

§ 12. This downfall of the popish power in England, however, was of little advantage to the lovers of a purer religion. For the king, though he destroyed the empire of the pontiff, yet retained for the most part the old religion; and he persecuted, and sometimes punished capitally, those

(11) *Herm. Hamelmann's* Historia Ecclesiast. renati Evangelii, per inferiorem Saxoniam et Westphaliam, pt. ii., p. 1196, &c., in his collected works. *M. E. von Printz*, Specimen Historiæ Anabaptist., cap. x., xi., xii., p. 94. [*Jo. Sleidan's* Commentarii de statu relig. et reipublicæ, sub Carolo V., lib. x. *Gerdes*, Miscellania Gronengensis, tom. ii., p. 377, &c., 569, &c. *Robertson's* History of the reign of Charles V., book v., p. 245–250, ed. N. York, 1829.—*Tr.*]

(12) [*Dr. Mosheim* errs in representing *Henry's* passion for *Anne Boleyn*, as the first and grand cause of the king's wish to be divorced from his queen. His father had scrupled the legitimacy of the marriage; a foreign court had made it an objection to intermarriage with his children by this wife; and his subjects, very generally, entertained apprehensions respecting the succession to his crown, from the same cause. It was state policy which first led to the marriage; but it appears never to have given entire satisfaction to any one. Doubtless *Henry* was sincere in professing to have scruples of conscience on the subject. But there were also other causes. The queen's beauty had faded, and some diseases had rendered her person less agreeable. Political considerations, or apprehensions respecting his successor, had influence. And after these causes had operated some time, *Anne Boleyn* came to court, and the king was charmed with her. This, though the last, was henceforth probably not the least reason for his final resolution to divorce his queen. See *Hume's* History of England, ch. xxx., vol. iii., p. 288, &c. *Burnet's* History of the Reformation, vol. i., book ii., at the beginning.—*Tr.*]

(13) Besides *Gilb. Burnet*, and others who have composed direct histories of the Reformation in England, the *Acts* of this memorable event, as collected by *David Wilkins*, in his Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, tom. iii., p. 424, &c., should be consulted. See also *Raynal's* Anecd. Historiques, Politiques, Militaires, tom. i., pt. ii., p. 90, &c., and the Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique et crit., tom. ii., p. 388, article *Bolena*.

who thought differently from himself on religious subjects. Besides, he understood the title he had assumed of *supreme head of the British church*, to invest him with the powers of the Roman pontiff; so that he had a right to make decrees respecting religion, and to prescribe to the citizens what they must believe and practise. During his life therefore, religion in England was coincident with the king's character, that is, uncertain and changeable. Yet the archbishop of Canterbury, *Thomas Cranmer*, who had the king's confidence and was a patron of the reformed religion, exerted himself as much as he prudently could, and as the instability of the king and other difficulties would allow, by his writings and his actions, to diminish gradually the old superstition and ignorance, and to increase the number of the friends of *Luther*.(14)

§ 13. After the pontiff's first proposed council was set aside, various negotiations for restoring peace and harmony, were held between the emperor and the Protestants; but without any determinate and solid benefit, because the pontiff, by his legates and others, generally disconcerted all their measures. In the year 1541, the emperor, much to the displeasure of the pontiff, ordered select individuals of both parties to confer together respecting religion at Worms. Accordingly, *Philip Melancthon* and *John Eckius* held a discussion during three days.(15) The discussion was then transferred, for certain reasons, to the diet of Ratisbon of the same year; in which the project of a nameless writer, who stated conditions for a peace, was especially subjected to examination.(16) But the pro-

(14) Besides *Burnet*, see *Dan. Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. i., ch. i., p. 11, &c. [In the year 1536, king *Henry*, with the sanction of the convocation, prescribed what doctrines should be taught in the churches; the substance of which may be seen in *Burnet*, Hist. Reform., vol. i., p. 280, &c., ed. London, 1825, and in *Neal*, l. c., p. 69, &c., ed. Portsm., 1816. Mr. *Neal* remarks upon these instructions: "One sees here *the dawn* of the Reformation; the scriptures and the ancient creeds are made the standards of faith, without the tradition of the church or decrees of the pope; the doctrine of justification by faith is well stated; four of the seven sacraments are passed over, and purgatory is left doubtful. But transubstantiation, auricular confession, the worshipping of images and saints, still retained." In the year 1539, the king and the opposers of the Reformation procured a statute to be passed in both houses of parliament, making it penal to speak or write, at all, against any one of the six following articles. "*First*, that in the sacrament of the altar, after the consecration, there remained no substance of bread and wine, but under these forms the natural body and blood of Christ were present. *Secondly*, that communion in both kinds was not necessary to salvation to all persons, by the law of God; but that both the flesh and blood of Christ were together in each of the kinds. *Thirdly*, that priests, after the order of priests (after admission to orders), might not marry, by the law of God. *Fourthly*, that vows of chastity ought to be observed, by the law of God. *Fifthly*, that the use of private masses ought to be continued; which, as it was agreeable to God's law, so man received great benefit by them. *Sixthly*, that auricular confession was expedient and necessary, and ought to be retained in the church." This, which was called "the bloody statute," was enforced during the residue of *Henry's* reign, or till the year 1547. It brought many to the stake, and to prison; and caused the Reformation to go back rather than advance, during these eight years. See *Burnet*, l. c., p. 334, &c., and *Neal*, l. c., p. 75, &c.—*Tr.*]

(15) See *Jo. Andr. Rœder's* Tract, de Colloquio Wormatiensi, Norimb., 1744, 4to, [and *Sleidan's* Comment. de statu relig. et reipubl., lib. xiii., sub. finem.—*Tr.*]

(16) See *Jo. Erdmann Bieck's* Triple Interim, (written in German), ch. i., p. 1, &c. [This conference was held in April, 1541. The emperor selected the disputants: on the part of the Catholics *John Eckius*, *Julius Pflug*, *George Gropper*; on the part of the Protestants, *Ph. Melancthon*, *Martin Bucer*, and *John Pistorius*. The author of the written project (called the *first* Interim), here read and discussed, was supposed to be *Geo. Gropper*. See *Sleidan*, l. c. *Robertson's* Charles V., book vi., p. 294, &c., ed. 1829.—*Tr.*]

tracted deliberation had no other effect but to bring the parties to agree, that this very difficult subject should be more fully examined in the future council, or if a council should not be called, then in the next diet of Germany.

§ 14. After this, a very disturbed state of things ensued, which required the deliberations for settling religious controversies to be deferred. In the diet of Spire in 1542, the pontiff by his legate, renewed his promise of a council; and signified that it should be held at Trent, if that place was agreeable. The king of the Romans, *Ferdinand*, and the Catholic princes, gave their assent; but the Protestants rejected both the place and the council proposed by the pontiff; and demanded a legitimate and free council, that is, one that should be exempt from the prescriptions and the authority of the pontiff. Nevertheless the pontiff, with the consent of the emperor, proceeded to appoint the council; and at the diet of Worms, A.D. 1545, the emperor negotiated with the Protestants to bring them to approve of the council at Trent. But these negotiations failing, and the emperor seeing no prospect that the Protestants would ever subject themselves to the council, listened to the advice of *Paul* III., who urged a resort to arms, and in conjunction with that pontiff, he secretly prepared for war. The leaders of the Protestants, the landgrave of Hesse and the elector of Saxony, took measures not to be overwhelmed in a defenceless state, and raised forces on their side.(17) While this storm was gathering, *Luther*, who was disposed to contend with prayers and patience rather than with arms, met a peaceful death at Eisleben his native town, on the 18th of February, 1546.(18)

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION, FROM THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE WAR OF SMALCALD [A.D. 1546], TO THE CONCLUSION OF A RELIGIOUS PEACE [A.D. 1555].

§ 1. Commencement of the War of Smalcald.—§ 2. The War: and the Reverses of the Protestants.—§ 3. Form of the Interim.—§ 4. Commotions arising from it.—§ 5. The Council of Trent resumed.—§ 6. Maurice disconcerts the Plans of the Emperor.—§ 7. His War against the Emperor. The Transaction at Passau.—§ 8. Diet of Augsburg. Religious Peace.—§ 9. The Reformation in England.—§ 10. Scotland.—§ 11. Ireland.—§ 12. The Netherlands.—§ 13. Spain and Italy.—§ 14. Estimate of the Reformation.

§ 1. THE destruction of those who should oppose the council of Trent, had been agreed on between the emperor and the pontiff; and the opening of the council, was to be the signal for taking up arms. Accordingly, that council had scarcely commenced its deliberations, at the beginning of the year 1546, when it was manifest from various indications, that an imperitorial-papal war impended over the Protestants. At the diet of Rat-

(17) [See *Robertson's* Hist. of Charles V., book vii., p. 322, &c.—*Tr.*]

(18) [See *Alexander Bower's* Life of Luther, chap. xi.—*Tr.*]

isbon indeed of this year, a new conference or dispute between the principal theologians of the two parties had been instituted; but its progress and issue clearly showed, that the cause was to be decided not by arguments but by arms. The fathers at Trent passed their first decrees, which the Protestants again firmly rejected at the diet of Ratisbon: and soon after the emperor proscribed the Protestant leaders, and began to assemble an army against them.

§ 2. The Saxon and Hessian princes led their forces into Bavaria, to meet the emperor; and they cannonaded his camp at Ingolstadt. A battle was expected to ensue. But as *Maurice* duke of Saxony, (who coveted the riches and the high rank of his uncle *John Frederic*, and was seduced by the promises of the emperor,) now invaded the Saxon territories, and as the confederates of Smalcald were not harmonious in their views, and as the money promised them from France did not arrive, the Protestant army was broken up, and the elector of Saxony returned home. The emperor pursued him by forced marches, and fell upon him unawares, near Mühlberg on the Elbe, the 24th of April, 1547, where after an unsuccessful battle, and betrayed probably by his friends, he was taken prisoner. The other Protestant prince, *Philip* of Hesse, by advice of his son-in-law *Maurice*, and of the elector of Brandenburg, threw himself upon the mercy of the emperor, expecting according to the emperor's promise, to be forgiven and to be set at liberty. But he was nevertheless kept a prisoner; and it is reported, that the emperor violated his promise in this instance, and deluded the Hessian prince by the ambiguity of some German words. But this part of the history has not yet been so investigated as to make the imprisonment of the landgrave, and the grounds of it, altogether clear.(1)

§ 3. After this victory, the cause of the Protestants appeared irrecoverably ruined, and that of the Roman pontiff triumphant. In the diet held soon after at Augsburg, (and which was surrounded by troops), the emperor demanded of the Protestants, to submit the decision of the religious controversy to the council of Trent. The greater part consented, and in particular *Maurice* of Saxony, who had received from *Charles* the electoral dignity, of which, together with a part of his territories, *John Frederic* had been deprived, and who also was extremely solicitous for the liberation of his father-in-law, the landgrave of Hesse. But the emperor lost the benefit of this assent to the council of Trent. For upon a rumour that the pestilence had appeared at Trent, a great part of the fathers retired to Bologna; and thus the council was broken up.(2) Nor could the emperor prevail with the pope, to reassemble the council without delay. As

(1) Besides the accounts of the common historians, *Benj. Grosch* has well described all these transactions, in his Vertheidigung der Evangelischen Kirche gegen Gottfr. Arnold, p. 29, &c. [See *Sleidan's* Comment. de statu relig. et reipubl., lib. xviii., and the very full history of this war, in *Robertson's* Hist. of Charles V., book viii., p. 338, &c., and book ix., p. 360, &c.—*Tr.*]

(2) [The report of a pestilence was a mere pretence. The pope, *Paul* III., was equally jealous of the council, which had not been disposed in all respects to govern itself by his prescription, and of the growing power of the emperor, which he did not wish to see farther increased by the council. He indeed hated the Protestants; but he did not wish to see the emperor, under colour of enforcing the decrees of the council, acquire a more absolute authority over Germany. He had already withdrawn his troops from the imperial army; and he now wished to see the council dispersed. The Spanish members opposed him; but he found means to prevail.—*Schl.*]

the prospect of a council was now more distant, the emperor deemed it necessary in the interim, to adopt some project, which might preserve the peace in regard to religion until the council should assemble. Hence he caused a paper to be drawn up by *Julius Pflug*, bishop of Nauemburg, *Michael Sidonius* a papist, and *John Agricola* of Eisleben; which should serve as a rule of faith and worship to the professors of both the old religion and the new, until the meeting of the council; and this paper, because it had not the force of a *permanent* law, was commonly called the *Interim*.(3)

§ 4. This paper, called the *Interim*, though very favourable to the papal cause, was equally displeasing to the pontiff and to the professors of the true or Lutheran religion. When the emperor communicated it to the diet of Augsburg, the elector of Mayence, without taking the sense of the members, rose, and in the name of the diet, assented to it. Most of the princes therefore, though reluctantly, acquiesced. Those who opposed it, were for the most part compelled by the power and arms of the emperor to submit; and the calamities and oppressions which followed in Germany, are almost indescribable. *Maurice* elector of Saxony, who occupied middle ground between those who approved and those who rejected the *Interim*, held several consultations at Leipsic and other places, in the year 1548, with his theologians and principal men of whom *Philip Melancthon* was most distinguished, that he might determine what course to pursue. The result of the protracted deliberation was, that *Melancthon* (whom the other theologians followed), partly from fear of the emperor, and partly from condescension to his sovereign, decided that the whole instrument called the *Interim* could by no means be admitted; but that there was no impediment to receiving and approving it, so far as it concerned things not essential in religion, or things *indifferent* (*adiaphoris*). This decision gave rise to the *Adiaphoristic* controversy among the Lutherans, which will be described in the history of the *Lutheran church*. In this state of things, the cause of the reformed religion of *Luther* was in imminent peril: and had the pontiff and the emperor known how to take advantage of their good fortune, they might doubtless have either totally crushed the Lutheran church, or depressed it greatly and brought it into embarrassment.

§ 5. In the midst of these contests, *Julius* III., who succeeded *Paul* III.

(3) See *Jo. Erdm. Bieck's* dreyfaches Interim, Leip., 1721, 8vo. *Jac. Osiander's* Historia Eccles., cent. xvi., lib. ii., c. 68, p. 425, and others. Respecting the authors and the editions of the *Interim*, see a disquisition in the Dänische Bibliothek, part v., p. 1, &c., and part vi., p. 185, &c. [The *Interim* may be seen, at large, in *Goldast's* Constitutiones Imperiales, tom. i., p. 518, &c.; also in *Le Fevre's* continuation of *Fleury's* Ecclesiast. History, lib. cxlv., § 21–23, Latin, by *R. P. Alexander*, vol. xxxix., p. 540–586. See also *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reformat., vol. i., p. 674, &c. *Robertson's* Hist. of Charles V., book ix., p. 377, &c. The *Interim* consisted of 26 articles, drawn up with great care, and in a very conciliatory spirit. On most doctrinal points, such as man's primitive rectitude, apostacy, original sin, redemption by Christ, necessity of divine grace, human merit, &c., it adopted very much, scriptural views and language; and might have been assented to by the Protestants, without sacrificing perhaps any fundamental truths. But it retained the mass, all the seven sacraments, the hierarchy, the traditions, the ceremonies, in short, the whole exterior of the Catholic establishment and worship, with the sole exceptions of tolerating the marriage of the clergy and communion in both kinds. Yet it limited the authority of the pontiff, and so explained the grounds and uses of the Romish rites, as to make them the least offensive possible.—*Tr.*]

in the government of the Romish church A.D. 1550, being overcome by the entreaties of the emperor, consented to revive the council of Trent. The emperor therefore, at the diet of Augsburg, which he again surrounded with his troops, conferred with the princes on the prosecution of the council. The major part agreed, that the council ought to go on; and *Maurice* elector of Saxony, consented, yet only on certain conditions.(4) At the close of the diet therefore, A.D. 1551, the emperor directed all to prepare themselves for the council, and promised to use his endeavours, that every thing should there be done in a religious and Christian manner, and without passion. Hence confessions of faith to be exhibited to the council, were drawn up; one in Saxony, by *Melancthon*, and another at Würtemberg, by *John Brentius*. Besides the ambassadors of the duke, some of the theologians of Würtemberg also, repaired to Trent. But the Saxons, at the head of whom was *Melancthon*, though they set out, advanced no farther than Nuremberg; for their sovereign [the elector *Maurice*] only made a show of obedience to the will of the emperor, while he was really designing to subject *Charles* to his own pleasure.

§ 6. What plans and purposes *Charles* V. was pursuing amid these commotions in Germany, will appear, if we consider the circumstances of the times, and compare the different parts of his conduct. The emperor, relying more than prudence would dictate upon his own powers and good fortune, wished to make these disquietudes arising out of religion, subservient to the enlargement and establishment of his power in Germany, and to the diminution of the resources and the rights of the princes. Moreover, as he had in like manner long wished to see the authority and dominion of the Roman pontiffs diminished, and confined within some definite limits, so that they might no longer interrupt the progress of his designs, so he hoped, by means of the council, this wish might be realized; since by means of the councils formerly held at Constance and Basil, a check was laid upon the exorbitant lust of power in the Romish bishops. For he had no doubts that by means of his ambassadors and bishops, those of Spain and Germany, and others, he should be able so to control the deliberations of the council, that all its decrees and acts would be conformable to his plans and wishes.(5) But all these expectations and designs were frustrated, by that very *Maurice*, by whose assistance principally *Charles* had been able to break down the power of the Protestants.

§ 7. Long had *Maurice* in vain solicited for the liberation of his father-in-law, *Philip* of Hesse; and long had the greatest princes of Germany and Europe importunately petitioned the emperor to set at liberty both the landgrave of Hesse and the recent elector of Saxony. When, therefore, *Maurice* perceived that he had been duped, and that *Charles* had hostile designs upon the liberties of Germany, he entered into an alliance with the

(4) [These conditions were, that the council should rescind all its past acts, and begin anew; that the divines of the Augsburg Confession should not only be heard, but have the right of voting; that the pontiff should place himself under the jurisdiction of the council, and should not have the presidency of it; and that he should release the bishops from their oath of allegiance to him, so that they might give their opinions freely. The assent under these conditions, was read before the diet, and request made that it might be entered entire upon the journals: but this request was refused. See *Sleidan's* Comment., &c., lib. xxii., fol. 576, ed. 1556.—*Tr.*]

(5) [This is clearly and satisfactorily shown, in *Robertson's* History of Charles V., vol. iii., p. 58, 207.—*Schl.*]

king of France and with certain German princes, for asserting the rights of the Germanic nation; and in the year 1552, he led forth a well-appointed army against the emperor. And he conducted the business with such celerity and vigour, that he was near to falling upon *Charles* unawares, and in a state of security at Inspruck. This sudden storm so terrified *Charles*, that he appeared quite ready to agree to any terms of peace; and soon after, at Passau, he not only gave present tranquillity to the Protestants, but promised to assemble a diet within six months, at which the long-protracted religious contests should be wholly terminated. Thus the very man, who had given a severer blow perhaps than any other to the Protestant cause, was the man to establish and give triumph to that cause, when it was nearly given up and abandoned. Yet *Maurice* did not live to see the result of his undertaking; for the next year, he fell in a battle against *Albert* of Brandenburg, at Sivershausen.(6)

§ 8. The diet, which the emperor promised at the *pacification* of Passau, could not be assembled, on account of commotions that arose in Germany, and other impediments, until the year 1555. But in this year, at Augsburg, and in presence of *Ferdinand* the emperor's brother, that memorable convention was held, which gave to the Protestants, after so much slaughter and so many calamities and conflicts, that firm and stable *religious*

(6) [*Maurice* was, all his life, a Protestant at heart. But he was selfish, ambitious, and ungrateful. His base attack upon the dominions of his uncle *John Frederic*, during the war of Smalcald, was the chief cause of the unhappy termination of that war, and of all the calamities endured by the Protestants from the year 1548 to 1552. During this period, he took sides with the emperor, for the sake of acquiring an increase of territory and the rank of an elector. Yet he did not abandon the Protestant religion, nor so enforce the *Interim* as to restrain the exercise of that religion among his subjects. He probably had been deceived by the emperor's hollow promises not to injure the cause of Protestantism. When he perceived this, and also discovered the emperor's designs to overthrow the liberties of Germany, he was mortified, stung by his conscience, and roused to indignation. He therefore determined to bring down the power of the emperor, and to rescue both the Protestant religion and the liberties of his country from oppression. See *Robertson's* History of Charles V., book x., p. 285, &c., 310, 344, 401, &c., ed. New-York, 1829, in 1 vol. 8vo. The treaty of *Passau*, between the emperor and Maurice, August 2d, 1552, laid the foundation of the liberties of the German Protestant church. "Its chief articles were, That before the 12th of August, the confederates shall lay down their arms and disband their forces; That on or before that day, the landgrave shall be set at liberty, and be conveyed in safety to his castle of Rheinfels; That a diet shall be held within six months, in order to deliberate concerning the most proper and effectual method of preventing for the future all disputes and dissensions about religion; That in the mean time, neither the emperor, nor any other prince, shall, upon any pretext whatever, offer any injury or violence to such as adhere to the confession of Augsburg, but shall allow them to enjoy the free and undisturbed exercise of their religion; That, in return, the Protestants shall not molest the Catholics, either in the exercise of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or in performing their religious ceremonies; That the imperial chamber shall administer justice impartially to persons of both parties; and Protestants be admitted indiscriminately with the Catholics to sit as judges in that court; That if the next diet should not be able to terminate the disputes with regard to religion, the stipulations in the present treaty in behalf of the Protestants, shall continue for ever in full power and vigour; That none of the confederates shall be liable to any action, on account of what had happened during the course of the war; That the consideration of those encroachments which had been made, as Maurice pretended, upon the constitution and liberties of the empire, shall be remitted to the approaching diet; That Albert of Brandenburg shall be comprehended in the treaty, provided he shall accede to it, and disband his forces before the 12th of August." *Robertson's* Charles V., l. c., p. 414, &c. See also *Sleidan's* Comment., &c., lib. xxiv., fol. 661.—*Tr.*]

peace which they still enjoy. For on the 25th of September, after various discussions, all those who had embraced the Augsburg Confession, were pronounced free and exempt from all jurisdiction of the pontiff and the bishops; and were bidden to live securely, under their own laws and regulations; and liberty was given to all Germans, to follow which of the two religions they pleased; and lastly, all those were declared to be public enemies of Germany, who should presume to make war upon others or to molest them, on the ground of their religion.(7) Nothing scarcely could more clearly demonstrate the superstition, ignorance, and wretchedness of that age, and consequently the necessity that existed for a reformation in the prevalent views of religion and things sacred, than the fact, that most of the Germans needed to be instructed by so many writings, controversies, and wars, before they could assent to regulations so equitable, and so consonant to reason and the holy scriptures.

§ 9. While these events were taking place in Germany, the English were deploring the very near extinction of the light of pure religion; and witnessing the continual persecution of their countrymen, they esteemed those Germans happy who had escaped from the Romish tyranny. *Henry* VIII., whose vices obstructed the progress of the reformation, died in the year 1547. His son and successor *Edward* VI., a child in years but mature in wisdom, intelligence, and virtue, having collected around him learned men from every quarter, and particularly some from Germany of the mildest character, as *Martin Bucer* and *Paul Fagius*, ordered the kingdom to be purged entirely of the popish fictions, and a better religion to be publicly taught. But he was removed by death in 1553, to the immense grief of his subjects.(8) His sister *Mary*, daughter of that *Catharine*

(7) [See *Jo. Schilter's* tract, de Pace religiosa, published in 1700, 4to. *Christoph. Lehmann's* Acta publica et originalia de Pace religiosa, Frankf., 1707, fol. [The compact entitled the religious peace, as extracted from the acts of the diet of Augsburg of Sept. 25, 1555, may be seen at large in *B. G. Struve's* Corpus Juris Publici Academicum, ed. 2d, Jena, 1734, p. 169–214. It embraces 22 articles; and is founded on the treaty of Passau, described in the preceding note. It places the believers in the Augsburg Confession and the Catholics, on the same ground, as citizens and as members of the empire; and forbids all molestation of the one class by the other; forbids proselyting, but allows voluntary transition from one religion to the other. Yet beneficed Catholics, if they turned Protestants, were to lose their benefices. All other denominations of Christians, except Catholics and Lutherans, are expressly excluded from the privileges of this compact. (Art. IV. "Attamen cæteri omnes, qui alteri prænominatarum harum binarum Religionum non sint adhærentes, sub hac pace, *non comprehensi, sed plane exclusi esse debent.*") The *Zwinglians*, *Calvinists*, or *Reformed*, were therefore left in the same state as before. The treaty still contemplated a more full adjustment of all points of controversy, in a general or national council, or in a future diet; yet it contained an express stipulation, that the principles here settled, should remain inviolate for ever. In the imperial cities, and wherever the professors of both religions had hitherto enjoyed equal religious liberty, they were to continue to enjoy the same.—The pope was exceedingly displeased with this peace; and he tried to persuade the emperor to renounce it, promising to absolve him from his oath. But the emperor would not consent. Yet the Catholics were never satisfied with it. And some ambiguities in the language of it, and some of its odious provisions, such as excluding all but Lutherans and Catholics from a participation in it, and subjecting beneficed Catholics to the loss of their livings if they became Lutherans, led on to contention, and at last produced in the next century, the thirty years' war, which nearly ruined Germany.—*Tr.*]

(8) [By the act of supremacy, the sole right of reforming the church was in the crown. This right the regents claimed and exercised, during the king's minority, notwithstanding the objections of the opposers of reform. *Henry* had assigned to his son sixteen regents of the kingdom, besides 12 privy counsellors; and a majority of these

whom *Henry* VIII. had divorced, was heiress of the kingdom; and being a woman bigotedly devoted to the religion of her ancestors, and governed by her passions, she again obtruded the Catholic religion upon the Britains; nor did she hesitate to put to the most cruel death great numbers of such as resisted, and even persons of the highest rank, among whom *Thomas Cranmer* archbishop of Canterbury and author of the recent prostration of the papal power in England, stood conspicuous. But the death of the queen, who departed without issue in 1558, put an end to this scene of rage.(9) For her successor on the British throne, *Elizabeth*, a woman of

were friendly to the reformation. The leading reformers at that time were, king *Edward* himself, the duke of *Somerset* lord protector, the archbishops *Cranmer* and *Holgate*, *Sir W. Paget* secretary of state, lord viscount *Lisle* high admiral, and the bishops *Holbeach*, *Goodrick*, *Latimer*, and *Ridley*. The leaders in opposition to reform were, the princess *Mary*, earl *Wriothesley*, and bishops *Tonstal*, *Gardiner*, and *Bonner*. The obstacles to reformation were, the profound ignorance and superstition of the people at large, the resistance of the bishops, the incompetence and selfishness of the inferior clergy, the want of ecclesiastical funds, and the deficiency of preachers who could spread the light of truth. The court ordered a visitation of all the churches; and forbid any to preach out of their parishes without a license, during the visitation. The first book of Homilies was set forth, to be read in the churches where the incumbents were incompetent to preach; and thirty-six royal injunctions, regulating worship and religious order, were issued. Bishops *Bonner* and *Gardiner* refused obedience to the injunctions, and were sent to prison. The parliament which met in November, 1547, repealed the laws which sanctioned persecution, and also the statute of the *six articles* which had been a bar to reformation, ordered the communion to be given in both kinds, empowered the king to appoint all bishops, and sequestered what remained of chantry lands and other pious legacies of former days. This year, *Peter Martyr* of Florence was made divinity professor at Oxford, and *Martin Bucer* at Cambridge. *Ochinus* and *Fagius*, also foreigners, were employed in the English church. Religious controversy grew warm, and was introduced into the pulpits. In September the king forbid all preaching, till he should decree *what* might be preached. Some bishops were appointed to reform the offices of the church, or the formulas of worship. This was the first liturgy of king *Edward*. In January, 1549, parliament ratified the new liturgy, and made it penal to use any other. A new visitation was appointed by the court, to see that the new liturgy was introduced. Some tumults and insurrections ensued, but they were soon quieted. The Anabaptists were persecuted, and likewise all opposers of the new liturgy. In November, 1550, parliament authorized the king to revise the canon law of England. A new digest in 51 tituli, was formed; but never sanctioned, being not completed till just before the king's death. The new ritual was pressed. The recusants were either papists who were attached to the old ritual, or *Non-conformists* who (like *Hooper*) objected to the sacerdotal garments and wished for a more simple worship. Both were persecuted. In 1551 *Cranmer* and *Ridley* drew up new articles of faith, 42 in number, which the council published. In 1552 the Common Prayer Book was again revised, and made nearly the same as it now is. In January, 1553, it was sanctioned by parliament. This year king *Edward* died, and the reformation was arrested, before it had obtained a firm establishment or that degree of perfection which its authors designed. See *Burnet's* History of the Reformat., vol. ii., part i., book i., and *Neal's* Hist. of the Puritans, vol i., chap. ii.—*Tr.*]

(9) [Queen *Mary* disguised her intentions, till fully established on the throne; and then proceeded to release from prison and restore to their sees the popish bishops, *Bonner*, *Gardiner*, *Tonstal*, &c., and to imprison the reformers, *Cranmer*, *Hooper*, *Coverdale*, *Rogers*, *Holgate*, and others. Eight hundred friends to reformation fled to the Continent, and settled chiefly along the Rhine. Among these were five bishops, five deans, four archdeacons, and above fifty doctors in divinity, besides noblemen, merchants, &c. The foreigners, *Peter Martyr*, and *John a Lasco* with his congregation, were expelled the country. A compliant parliament, in October, 1553, repealed the laws of king *Edward* in favour of a reformation, restored things to the state in which *Henry* VIII. left them, and made it penal to practise the reformed religion. The convocation fully agreed with the parliament. In 1554 the queen appointed a visitation of the churches, to restore the former state of things. Six bishops were turned out, the mass was set up and the

masculine resolution and sagacity, rescued her country entirely from the power of the pontiff, and established that form of religion and worship which still prevails in England. This is different from that form which the counsellors of *Edward* had devised, and approaches nearer to the usages and institutions of the previous times; yet it is very far removed from that which is held sacred at Rome.(10)

§ 10. Into the neighbouring kingdom of Scotland the elements of a purer religion were early introduced, by certain young noblemen who had resided in Germany. But the papal power supported by inhuman laws and penalties, for many years prevented it from taking firm root. The principal author of the entire abolition of the Romish dominion over Scotland, was *John Knox* a disciple of *Calvin*, a man of eloquence and of a bold and fearless character. Proceeding from Geneva to Scotland in the year 1559, he in a short time so roused up the people by his discourses, that the majority of them abandoned the institutions of their fathers and destroyed every vestige of

popish rites every where restored. All the married and recusant clergy, to the number of some thousands, were deprived. This year the queen married *Philip* king of Spain. In November an obsequious parliament was assembled, cardinal *Pole* was recalled, and as papal legate he fully restored popery, and reunited England to the papal throne. The parliament proceeded in 1555, to repeal all laws in favour of a reformation passed since the time *Henry* VIII. first began his contest with the pope, and to revive the old laws against heretics. The fires of persecution were now kindled. *John Rogers* was the first martyr; and bishops *Ridley*, *Latimer*, and *Cranmer*, were among the victims. Of these executions, bishop *Bonner* was the chief agent. The whole number put to death during the remainder of this reign, was about 288, besides those who died in prison and great numbers who fled the country. Popery was now completely triumphant; and the reformation seemed entirely suppressed. See *Burnet*, l. c., book ii., and *Neal*, l. c., ch. iii.—*Tr.*]

(10) [Queen *Mary* died, November 17th, 1558, and her sister *Elizabeth* was immediately proclaimed. She had a vigorous, resolute mind, and was friendly to the reformation. Claiming supreme power both in church and state, she determined to restore forthwith the reformed religion. In December, 1558, she inhibited all preaching for the present. The exiles hastened home, and were somewhat divided among themselves in respect to their views of discipline and rites of worship, in consequence of what they had witnessed while abroad. The English bishops were all opposed to reformation. The court secured a compliant parliament, which met in January, 1559, repealed the persecuting laws of queen *Mary*, invested the sovereign with power to regulate the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the church, to appoint all bishops, and to establish *High Commission* courts, with powers nearly equal to the Inquisition. The queen appointed doctors *Parker*, *Grindal*, *Cox*, and others, to revise king *Edward's* liturgy; which being slightly altered, was ratified by parliament in April, and enjoined upon the whole nation by law. On the rise of parliament, the bishops were called upon to take the oath of supremacy. All except one, refused; and were turned out, to the number of fourteen. New bishops favourable to the reformation, were appointed by the queen, and consecrated by the ex-bishops of king *Edward's* reign. The queen now ordered a general visitation of the churches; and issued fifty-two injunctions, regulating worship and discipline, the lives and duties of clergymen, rites, ceremonies, holy days, &c., with penalties against recusants. Of the clergy, only about 200 refused obedience and lost their livings. In 1562, the parliament confirmed the reformation effected by the queen. The convocation revised the forty-two articles of faith of king *Edward*, made some not very important alterations, and reduced the number to *thirty-nine;* yet they were not ratified by parliament till 1571. Respecting the forms of worship, the convocation were nearly equally divided; and they debated with great warmth, the minority urging a greater simplicity of worship. Here the *Puritan* party began to show itself. But the queen was fond of a splendid worship, and claiming supreme dominion in religious matters, she rigorously enforced uniformity. Thus the reformation was arrested, and the established church in England has ever since remained substantially the same as in the year 1562. See *Burnet*, l. c., vol. ii., pt. i., book iii.; *Neal's* Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i., ch. iv.—*Tr.*]

the Romish religion.(11) From that time onward, the Scots have pertinaciously held to that form of religion and discipline, which was established at Geneva under the auspices of *John Calvin*, *Knox's* preceptor; nor could any considerations afterwards induce them to adopt the ecclesiastical institutions and forms of worship of the English.

§ 11. In Ireland, the reformation was exposed to the same fluctuations and fortunes as in England. When *Henry* VIII. upon the abrogation of the pontifical power, was declared *supreme head of the English church*, *George Brown*, an English Augustinian monk whom the king in 1535 had created archbishop of Dublin, proceeded to purge the churches of his province of their images, relics, and superstitious rites; and he exerted such influence, that the king's *supremacy* (by which was meant the royal power over the church) was acknowledged in Ireland. And hence, the king soon after expelled the monks from Ireland, and destroyed their houses. Under *Edward* VI. the reformation in Ireland continued to be urged forward by the same archbishop. But *Mary* the sister of *Edward*, persecuted with fire and sword those who embraced the reformed religion, in Ireland as well as in England; and *Brown* and the other bishops who favoured the reformation, were deprived of their offices. Under *Elizabeth* however, every thing was restored; and the Irish adopted the form of religion and discipline which was established in England.(12)

(11) *Dan. Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. i., p. 165, &c., 232, 234, 569, and others. *Dan. Calderwood's* History of Scotland's Reformation, Lond., 1680, fol. *Geo. Buchanan's* Rerum Scoticarum Historia, lib. xvi., § 21, &c., p. 361, &c., ed. Ruddimann. *Jac. Melvil's* Memoires, vol. i., p. 73, &c. [*Tho. M'Crie's* Life of John Knox, New-York, 1813, 8vo. *W. Robertson's* Hist. of Scotland, New-York, 1829, 8vo. *J. Scott's* Lives of the Prot. Reformers in Scotland, Edinb., 1810, 8vo.—The martyrdom of *Patrick Hamilton* in 1527 at St. Andrews, made a deep impression on many of his countrymen. It produced inquiry on religious subjects; and from that time there were always more or fewer Scots who preached against the prevailing religion; e. g., friar *Seaton*, one *Forest*, and others. But the priests frequently brought the reformers to the stake. Two were burned in 1534; while others fled into England. In 1539 five were burned at Edinburgh, and two at Glasgow. In the same year the famous *George Buchanan* went into exile. In 1542 several Scotish noblemen were carried prisoners of war into England, where some of them imbibed a favourable opinion of the reformed religion. In 1543 *Hamilton*, earl of Arran and lord protector, was friendly to the reformed; but he was so vigorously opposed by cardinal *Beton*, that he dared not openly protect them. In 1545 *George Wisheart* was burned by cardinal *Beton*, to the general disgust of the nobility. A number of young men of spirit and birth, associated together, and assassinated the cardinal in his palace of St. Andrews, and then taking possession of the castle, held it for some years, and thus afforded a rendezvous for the reformed. In 1547 *John Knox* retired thither with his pupils, and was soon made a preacher. St. Andrews was afterwards besieged and taken; and *Knox* with the other prisoners was sent to France, and there kept in confinement. In 1552 the queen mother found it necessary to purchase the support of the reformed now a powerful party, by affording them protection; and for six years they suffered little molestation. In 1558 the queen was obliged by her allies to withdraw her protection, and the reformed, now quite numerous especially in the large towns and among the nobles, were again persecuted. The burning of *Walter Mill*, induced them to combine and to assert their right to believe and to worship according to the dictates of their consciences. A civil war ensued, and queen *Elizabeth* of England aided the Scotish reformed. In 1559 *John Knox* returned to Scotland, and by his eloquence and activity carried forward the reformation triumphantly. The queen regent died in June, and peace was concluded in August, 1560. The parliament assembled soon after, and in this year and the following, fully established the Protestant religion, according to the views of *John Knox*, and passed laws for the suppression of the Catholic religion throughout the country. Thus was the Scotish reformation at last achieved. See the authors above cited.—*Tr.*]

(12) See the life of *George Brown*, late

§ 12. Soon after the Scots, the inhabitants of the provinces now called the *United Netherlands* [or *the Dutch*], revolted entirely from the Roman pontiff. *Philip* II. king of Spain, very anxious for the safety of the Romish religion among a people so attached to liberty, determined to restrain the Belgians and secure their allegiance to the pontiff, by creating an additional number of bishops, by establishing among them the iniquitous tribunal of the Inquisition, and by other hard and insupportable laws. But this excessive care to preserve the old religion, instead of securing it from the dangers to which it was exposed, occasioned its total overthrow. In the year 1566 the nobility combined together, and remonstrated strongly against these new edicts; and meeting with repulse and contempt, they in conjunction with the people, openly trampled upon the things held sacred by the Romanists.(13) As the duke of Alva, who was sent from Spain with forces for that purpose, endeavoured to suppress these commotions with unparalleled cruelty and with innumerable slaughters, that furious civil war was produced to which the very powerful republic of the seven United Provinces of Belgium owes its origin. This republic rescued from the dominion of the Spaniards by its leader, *William* of Nassau prince of Orange, with the aid of *Elizabeth* queen of England, and of the king of France, adopted in the year 1573 the doctrines, the ecclesiastical organization, and the worship of the Swiss; yet gave to all the citizens entire

archbishop of Dublin, London, 1681, 4to, and which is reprinted in the collection called the *Harleyan Miscellany*, vol. v., Lond., 1745, 4to, No. LXXIII. [The reformed religion never has had the assent of the Irish people at large. Henry VIII. attempted little more than to establish his supremacy over the church of Ireland. And though he succeeded in procuring a major vote in the Irish parliament for it, the people and the clergy very generally would never admit it. He suppressed the monasteries and confiscated their funds, but this did not suppress popery. Queen *Mary* easily and at once, restored every thing in that country, except the confiscated property. She deprived archbishop *Brown* in 1554, but did not attempt to persecute "*with fire and sword*" the handful of Protestants in that country, until near the close of her reign, when she sent over *Dr. Cole* with a commission for that purpose. His commission however was stolen from him on the way, and he had to return to England for another. But before he reached Ireland a second time, the queen died, and he could not proceed to his bloody work. Queen *Elizabeth* caused herself to be proclaimed head of the church in Ireland; and undertook to enforce every where the Protestant doctrines and worship. But without success. The recusant clergy indeed lost their livings, and some Protestant clergymen were introduced into the country. But the people at large would not attend the Protestant worship. Thus, while Protestantism was the only established religion and the only one legally tolerated, it was followed by few except the officers of government, and such English families as removed to Ireland to enjoy the estates they acquired there. In the reign of *James* I., many Presbyterians from Scotland settled in the north of Ireland; and some English Puritans also took refuge there. Thus the Protestant population became considerably increased. But still the pure Irish, as well as the descendants of those English who settled in Ireland prior to the reformation, constituting together the majority of the population of the country, continued to adhere to the Catholic religion. During the two last centuries, the Protestant population and particularly the dissenting portion of it, has been considerably increased; yet the Catholic population has also increased; and it is said, that there have been more conversions from the Protestant to the Catholic faith in Ireland, during the period, than conversions from the Catholic faith to the Protestant. Thus Ireland is still a Catholic country, if we regard the population; though Protestant and of the church of England, if we regard only the religious establishments of the country.—*Tr.*]

(13) [*Dr. Maclaine* justly remarks, that "*Dr. Mosheim* here seems to distinguish too little between the spirit of the nobility and that of the multitude. Nothing was more *temperate* and *decent* than the conduct of the former; and nothing could be more *tumultuous* and *irregular* than the behaviour of the latter."—*Tr.*]

liberty of opinion on religious subjects, provided they attempted nothing against the peace and prosperity of the community.(14)

§ 13. In Spain and Italy, the reformed religion made great progress, soon after the first conflicts between *Luther* and the pontiffs. Very many in all the provinces of Italy but especially among the Venetians, the Tuscans, and the Neapolitans, avowed their alienation from the Romish religion. And in the kingdom of Naples in particular, very great and dangerous commotions arose from this source in the year 1536, which were excited chiefly by the celebrated *Bernh. Ochinus*, *Peter Martyr*, and others who preached against the superstitions; and which *Charles* V. and his viceroy for Naples had great difficulty to suppress.(15) The principal instru-

(14) The noble work of *Gerhard Brand* entitled a history of the Reformation in the Netherlands, written in Dutch and printed at Amsterdam, 1677, &c., in 4 vols. 4to, is especially to be consulted. [The first volume is properly the history of the Reformation, coming down to the year 1600; the other volumes contain a history of the Arminian controversy, and the events of the seventeenth century. There is a translated abridgment of *Brand* both in French and English, which gives a good condensed account. See also *Gerdes*, Historia Evangelii renovati, tom. iii., p. 1, &c., and *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. ii., p. 348-434.—*Philip* II. king of Spain, determined to purge the Netherlands of heretics; and for this purpose increased the number of bishops from *four* to *fourteen*; enacted severe laws against heretics; and determined to introduce the Inquisition into the country. These measures were generally offensive, and to the Catholics nearly as much so as to the Protestants. In 1566 most of the nobles, though generally Catholics, entered into an association to protect and defend the liberties of the country. The Protestants now 100,000 in number, petitioned the king for toleration; and though treated with contempt, they ventured to hold their meetings for worship openly, instead of meeting in private. They had now 50 or 60 places of meeting in Flanders, attended by 60,000 persons. Similar meetings were opened in Artois, Brabant, Utrecht, Seeland, Geldres, Friesland, &c. Attempts being made by the government to disperse their assemblies by force, they went armed to their places of worship. The same year the rabble first in Flanders, and afterwards in the other provinces, broke into the churches and destroyed the images, pictures, crosses, &c. *Philip* subsidized 13,000 German troops to support the government. Many of the rebellious Catholics voluntarily submitted, and the Protestants were reduced to great straits. Many were put to death, and many fled the country. The association of the nobles melted away. In 1567 the Netherlands were truly a conquered country. But *Philip* not yet satisfied, determined to punish his subjects still more; and therefore sent the duke of *Alva* with an army of Spaniards and Italians, to chastise the country. But severity only increased the number of Protestants, and drove the people to desperation. In 1568 *William* prince of Orange, assembled an army of refugees, and attacked the country without success. In 1572, he attacked the northern provinces by sea, and presently made himself master of Holland and several of the other provinces. The Hollanders now proclaimed him their stadtholder; and in 1573 he was able to attack some of the more southern provinces. The war lasted many years; and the united provinces fully set up the Protestant religion; while those that remained subject to a foreign jurisdiction, were obliged to acquiesce in popery as the established religion.—Respecting the toleration of other sects in the United Netherlands, *Dr. Maclaine* (who lived long in that country, and therefore may be considered good authority) observes, that: "It is necessary to distinguish between the toleration that was granted to the Roman Catholics, and that which the *Anabaptists*, *Lutherans*, and other Protestant sects, enjoyed. They were all, indiscriminately, excluded from the civil employments of the state; but though they were equally allowed the exercise of their religion, the latter were permitted to enjoy their religious worship in a more open and public manner than the former, from whom their churches were taken, and whose religious assemblies were confined to private conventicles, which had no external resemblance of the edifices usually set apart for divine worship."—*Tr.*]

(15) See *Peter Giannone*, Hist. civile du Royaume de Naples, [lib. xxxii., cap. v., sec. i.], tom. iv., p. 108, &c. The life of Galeacius in the Museum Helvet., tom. ii., p. 524. [See *Dan. Gerdes*, Specimen Italiæ Reformatæ—una cum Syllabo Reformatorum Italorum, Leyden, 1765, 4to, and *Dom. Rosius*

ments used by the Roman pontiffs for repelling this danger were the *inquisitors*, whom they sent into most parts of Italy, and who tortured and slew so many people that very many of the friends of the new religion fled into exile, and others returned ostensibly at least to the old religion. But the pontiff found it utterly impossible to bring the Neapolitans to tolerate the tribunal of the *Inquisition*, or even to admit *inquisitors* into their country.—Spain became infected with the Lutheran doctrines by different ways, and among others by those very theologians whom *Charles* V. took with him to Germany to confute the *heretics;* for those theologians returned to their country, tainted with the heresy. But the *Spanish Inquisition* by its accustomed severities, and especially by condemning to the flames, easily extinguished in the citizens all disposition to substitute a better religion in place of the old one.(16)

§ 14. It is unnecessary to wage controversy with those who say, that some of the persons who took a leading part in these great revolutions, were now and then guilty of grievous faults. For the best informed do not deny, that several transactions might have been conducted more discreetly, and that some of the men in power were more solicitous to promote their own interests than to advance pure religion. But on the other hand it is beyond all question, that many things which appear faulty to us

de Porta, Hist. Reformat. eccle. Ræticarum, Cur, 1771, vol. i., lib. ii., ch. ii., &c.—*Tr.*] "It was an attempt to introduce a Roman inquisitor into the city of *Naples*, that, properly speaking, produced the tumult and sedition which *Dr. Mosheim* attributes in this section to the pulpit discourses of *Ochino* and *Martyr;* for these famous preachers, and particularly the former, taught the doctrines of the reformation with great art, prudence, and caution, and converted many secretly without giving public offence. The emperor himself, who heard him at Naples, declared, that *he preached with such spirit and devotion as was sufficient to make the very stones weep.* After *Ochino's* departure from Naples, the disciples he had formed gave private instructions to others, among whom were some eminent ecclesiastics and persons of distinction, who began to form congregations and conventicles. This awakened the jealousy of the viceroy, *Toledo*, who published a severe edict against heretical books, ordered some productions of *Melancthon* and *Erasmus* to be publicly burned, looked with a suspicious eye on all kinds of literature, suppressed several academies, which had been erected about this time by the nobility for the advancement of learning, and having received orders from the emperor to introduce the Inquisition, desired pope *Paul* III. to send from Rome to Naples a deputy of that formidable tribunal. It was this, that excited the people to take up arms, in order to defend themselves from this branch of spiritual tyranny, which the Neapolitans never were patient enough to suffer, and which on many occasions they had opposed with vigour and success. Hostilities ensued, which were followed by an accommodation of matters and a general pardon; while the emperor and viceroy, by this resolute opposition, were deterred from their design of introducing this despotic tribunal into the kingdom of Naples. Several other attempts were afterwards made, during the reigns of *Philip* II., III., IV., and *Charles* II., to establish the Inquisition in Naples; but by the jealousy and vigilance of the people, they all proved ineffectual. At length the emperor *Charles* VI. in the beginning of this present century, published an edict, expressly prohibiting all causes, relating to the holy faith, to be tried by any persons, except the archbishops and bishops as ordinaries. See *Giannone*, Histoire de Naples, liv. xxxii., cap. v., sec. 2 and 3. Modern Univ. History, vol. xxviii., p. 273, &c., ed. 8vo."—*Macl.*]

(16) *Michael Geddes*, Spanish Protestant Martyrology, in his Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. i., p. 445. [See also note (61), p. 48, above.—*Tr.* It is noticeable, that all the Spanish theologians, who accompanied *Charles* V. to Germany and were associated with him afterwards in his retirement, fell after his death into the hands of the Inquisition, and were condemned, some to the flames and others to other kinds of death. These were *Augustine Casal* his court preacher, *Constantine Pontius* his confessor, the Dominican *Bartholomew Caranza*, confessor to king *Philip* and queen *Mary*, together with many others.—*Schl.*]

of the present age, should be classed among noble achievements, if we regard the times and the places of them and compare them with the frauds and the enormities both of the Roman pontiffs and their supporters. However, when we go into inquiry respecting the justice of the controversy which *Luther* first waged with the Roman pontiff, it is not a question that relates to the personal acts and virtues of individual men. Let some of these be supposed even worse men than they are generally esteemed to be, provided the *cause* for which they contended, be allowed to have been just and good.(17)

SECTION II.

THE GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Extension of the Christian Church.—§ 2. Zeal of the Pontiff in this respect.—§ 3. Propagation of Christianity, in India, Japan, and China.—§ 4. Zeal of the Protestants on this Subject.—§ 5. The Enemies of Christianity.—§ 6. Advantages of the Revival of Learning.—§ 7. The Study of the Greek and Latin Classics every where flourished.—§ 8. The State of Philosophy.—§ 9. Mode of teaching Theology.—§ 10. Religion Purified, and Morals Reformed.

§ 1. In extending the empire of Christ, the Spaniards and Portuguese were, if we may believe their own historians, equally active and successful.(1) And they carried indeed a sort of knowledge of Christianity to both North and South America, to a part of Africa, and to the maritime parts and islands of Asia which were subjugated by their fleets. And a large number of the inhabitants of these regions, who had before been destitute of all religion or were sunk in the grossest superstitions, ostensibly assumed the name of Christians. But these accessions to the Christian church will not be highly appreciated, or rather will be deplored, by those who consider, that these nations were coerced by barbarous and abominable laws and punishments to abandon the religion of their ancestors, and that all were enrolled as Christians who had learned to venerate immoderately their stupid instructers, and to exhibit by gestures and in words certain useless rites and forms. Such a judgment has been pronounced, not merely by those whom the Romish church calls *heretics*, but also by several of the best and most solid members of the Romish community, Frenchmen, Germans, Italians, Spaniards, and others.

§ 2. The Roman pontiffs, after losing a great part of Europe, manifested much more solicitude than before to propagate Christianity in other

(17) [See *Maclaine's* Appendix No. I. concerning the *spirit* and *conduct* of the first reformers, &c., subjoined to his translation of this section.—*Tr.*]

(1) See, among many others, *Jos. Fran. Lafitau's* Histoire des découvertes et conquestes des Portugais dans le nouveau monde, tom. iii., p. 420. He derives his accounts from the Portuguese writers. The other writers on this subject are enumerated by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Lux salutaris Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, cap. 42, 43, 48, 49. [A copious list of authors, who treat of both the civil and religious state of Spanish America in particular, may be seen prefixed to Dr. *W. Robertson's* History of the discovery and settlement of America. Much fuller, and extending to the whole American continent, is *O. Rich's* Bibliotheca Americana Nova, part i., A.D. 1701–1800. London, 1834, 8vo., p. 423.—*Tr.*]

parts of the world. For no better method occurred to them, both for repairing the loss they had sustained in Europe, and for vindicating their claims to the title of common fathers of the Christian church. Therefore, soon after the institution of the celebrated society of Jesuits in the year 1540, that order was especially charged constantly to train up suitable men, to be commissioned and sent by the pontiffs into the remotest regions as preachers of the religion of Christ. With what fidelity and zeal the order obeyed this injunction, may be learned from the long list of histories, which describe the labours and perils encountered by vast numbers of the fraternity while propagating Christianity among the pagan nations.(2) Immortal praise would undoubtedly belong to them, were it not manifest from unequivocal testimony, that many of them laboured rather to promote the glory of the Roman pontiff and the interests of their own sect, than the glory and interests of Jesus Christ.(3) It appears also from authors of high credit and authority, that the Indians were induced to profess Christianity by the *Inquisition* established by the Jesuits at Goa in Asia, and by their arms and penal laws, rather than by their exhortations and argumentations.(4) This zeal of the Jesuits excited the emulation not only of the Franciscans and Dominicans but likewise of other religious associations, and led them to renew this almost neglected work of missions.

§ 3. Among the Jesuits who took the lead in the arduous work of missions, no one acquired greater fame than *Francis Xavier*, commonly called the apostle of the Indies.(5) Possessing genius in no ordinary degree, and a very high degree of activity, he proceeded to the Portuguese East Indies in the year 1542, and in a few years filled no small part both of the continent and the islands with a knowledge of the Christian or rath-

(2) See *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Lux evangelii toti orbi exoriens, cap. xxxii., p. 550, &c.

(3) See *Christ. Eberh. Weismann's* Oratio de virtutibus et vitiis Missionar. Roman., in his Oratt. Academicæ, p. 286, &c. [Compare also his Introduct. in Memorabilia eccles. Histor. sacræ N. T., tom. ii., p. 684, &c—*Schl.*]

(4) See the Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesu, tom. ii., p. 171, 207, &c.

(5) Pope *Benedict* XIV., at the request of the king of Portugal in the year 1747, conferred on *Xavier* the dignity and title of *Protector of the Indies*. See Lettres edifiantes et curieuses des Missions etrangeres, tom. xliii., Pref., p. xxxvi., &c. The body of *Xavier* was interred at Goa, and is there worshipped with the greatest devotion, he being enrolled among the saints. A magnificent church is erected to him at Cotata in Portuguese India, where he is likewise devoutly invoked by the people. See the Lettres edifiantes des Missions, tome iii., p. 85, 89, 203; tome v., p. 38–48.; tom. vi., p. 78. [*Francis Xavier* was a younger son of a respectable family in the south of France, and born about A.D. 1506. He was educated at Paris, where *Ignatius Loyolą* found him teaching with reputation, and persuaded him to join his new society of Jesuits. In 1540 the king of Portugal requested some members of that society to be sent to his capital. *Xavier* and *Simon Rodriguez* were sent the next year; and from Lisbon *Xavier* shipped in 1541 for the East Indies, with the commission of papal legate and missionary. He arrived at Goa in 1542, and laboured with success in converting the natives and reforming the lives of the Portuguese, for about seven years. During this period he travelled extensively in Hindostan, twice visited the pearl fishery on the coast of Ceylon, and made repeated and extensive voyages among the islands to the east of the bay of Bengal. At length in 1549 he went to Japan, and there spent two years and a half with no great success as a missionary. He then returned to Goa, and immediately prepared for a mission to China. He arrived on the Chinese coast in the autumn of 1552, fell sick of a fever, and there expired. His remains were afterwards removed to Goa, and there interred. His life was written by the Jesuit *Horatius Tursellinus*, in 6 Books, Rome, 1594, 12mo. See *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol iii., p. 652, &c.—*Tr.*]

er the Romish religion. Thence he proceeded in the year 1549 to Japan, and with great celerity laid the foundation of that very numerous body of Christians which flourished for many years in that extensive empire. Afterwards, when attempting a mission to China, and already in sight of that powerful kingdom, he closed life at the island of Sancian in the year 1552.(6) After his death, other missionaries of the order of Jesuits entered China; among whom the most distinguished was *Matthew Ricci* an Italian, who so conciliated the favour of some of the chief men and even of the emperor, by his great skill in mathematics, that he obtained for himself and companions liberty to explain the doctrines of Christianity to the people.(7) He therefore may justly be considered as the founder and chief author of the numerous body in China which still worships Christ, though harassed and disquieted by various calamities.(8)

§ 4. Those who had withdrawn themselves from the jurisdiction of the pontiffs, possessing no territories beyond the bounds of Europe, could attempt almost nothing for the extension of the empire of Christ. Yet we are informed, that in the year 1556, fourteen missionaries were sent from Geneva to convert the Americans to Christ.(9) But by whom they were sent, and what success attended them, is uncertain. The English moreover, who near the close of the century sent out colonies to North Amer-

(6) See the writers referred to by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, in his Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, cap. xxxix., p. 677, &c. Add, *Jos. Fran. Lafitau's* Histoire des découvertes et conquestes des Portugais dans le nouveau monde, tome iii., p. 419, 424; tome iv., p. 63, 102, &c. Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesu, tom. i., p. 92, &c.

(7) *Jo. Bapt. du Halde's* Description de l'Empire de la Chine, tom. iii., p. 84, &c., ed. in Holland.

(8) That certain Dominicans had gone into China before *Ricci*, is certain. See *Lequien's* Oriens Christianus, tom. iii., p. 1354. But these had effected nothing of importance. [Three Italian Jesuits, *Matthew Ricci* of Macerata in Ancona, *Pasio* of Bologna, and *Roger* a Neapolitan, after devoting some years to the acquisition of the Chinese language in India, were by *Alexander Vinignano*, superintendent of the Jesuits' missions at Macao, in the year 1582 attached to an embassy sent to a governor in China. *Ricci* was acute, learned, modest, of winning address, persevering, and active. His knowledge of mathematics recommended him to the Chinese. He exhibited a map of the world, with which they were much taken. Connecting himself with the Bonzes or idolatrous priests, he assumed their dress and manners, and studied under their guidance seven years. He then assumed the garb of a Chinese man of letters, and wrote tracts on the Christian religion and particularly a catechism. Many persons of rank put themselves under his instruction, and he at length gathered a congregation of Christians. After twenty years' labour he gained access to the emperor, to whom he presented pictures of Christ and the Virgin Mary and a clock, and obtained liberty to visit the palace with his associates at pleasure. He now made converts very fast, and from all ranks of the people. *Siu*, one of the principal mandarins, and his granddaughter *Candida*, with her husband, became converts; and themselves built thirty churches in the provinces where they lived, and assisted the missionaries to procure the erection of ninety more, besides forty chapels for prayer, in another province. They also caused numerous religious tracts to be printed, and translations of comments on the scripture, and even the great *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas. They gathered the foundlings with which China abounded, and brought them up Christians. *Ricci's* two companions *Pasio* and *Roger*, were early recalled; but when he began to be successful, assistants were sent to him, who continued to labour after his decease, which took place in the year 1610. See *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reformat., vol. iii., p. 677, &c.—*Tr.*]

(9) *Bened. Pictet's* Oratio de Trophæis Christi; in his Oratt., p. 570. I have no doubt, that the celebrated admiral *Coligni* was the man who sent for these Genevan teachers to come to him into France. For that excellent man in the year 1555, projected sending a colony of Protestants to Brazil and America. See *Charlevoix's* Histoire de la nouvelle France, tome i., p. 22, &c., [and *Thuanus*, Historia Generalis, lib. xvi.—*Tr.*]

ica, planted there the religion which they themselves professed; and as these English colonies afterwards increased and gathered strength, they caused their religion to make progress among the fierce and savage tribes of those regions. I pass over the efforts of the Swedes for the conversion of the Finns and Laplanders, no small part of whom were still addicted to the absurd and impious rites of their progenitors.

§ 5. There was no public persecution of Christianity in this century. For those mistake the views and policy of the Mohammedans, who suppose that the Turks waged war upon the Christians in this age, for the sake of promoting their religion in opposition to that of Christ. But private enemies to all religion and especially to the Christian, (as many have represented), were lurking here and there in different parts of Europe, and they instilled their nefarious dogmas both orally and in books into the minds of the credulous. To this miserable class are reckoned, several of the peripatetic philosophers who illumined Italy, and in particular *Peter Pomponatius;* and besides these, among the French, *John Bodin, Francis Rabelais, Michael le Montagne, Bonaventure des Perieres, Stephen Dolet,* and *Peter Charron;* among the Italians, the sovereign pontiff *Leo* X., *Peter Bembus, Angelus Politianus, Jordan Brunus,* and *Bernardin Ochin;* among the Germans, *Theophrastus Paracelsus, Nicholas Taurellus,* and others.(10)

(10) The reader may consult *Jac. Fred. Reimmann's* Historia Atheismi et Atheorum, Hildesh., 1725, 8vo. *Jo. Fran. Buddæus,* Theses de Atheismo et superstitione, cap. i. *Peter Bayle's* Dictionnaire histor. et crit. in various articles; and others. [Pomponatius was born at Mantua in 1462, taught philosophy at Padua and Bologna, and died about A.D. 1526. In a treatise on the immortality of the soul, he denied that reason could decide the question, and maintained that it was purely a doctrine of faith, resting on the authority of revelation. In a treatise on incantations, he denied the agency of demons in producing strange occurrences; and explained the efficacy of relics, &c., by the influence of the imagination. In a tract on fate, free will, and predestination, he declared himself utterly unable satisfactorily to solve the difficulties of the subject; commented on the usual explanations, showed their insufficiency, and wished others to investigate the subject more fully. At the same time he pronounced the stoic and the Christian exposition of the subject the most plausible, and submitted himself to the authority of the church. Many account him an atheist; and the Inquisition condemned his principles. See *Bayle's* Dictionnaire, art. *Pompanace;* and *Stäudlin's* Gesch. der Moralphilosophie, p. 584.—John Bodin was a French jurist, civilian, and a man of letters; and died A.D. 1596, aged 67. His works were numerous, consisting of translations of the Latin classics, law, and political writings; and an unprinted dialogue between a Catholic, a Lutheran, an indifferantist, a naturalist, a Reformed, a Jew, and a Turk, on the subject of religion. He here appears a freethinker. See *Bayle,* l. c., art. *Bodin.*—Rabelais was a great wit and a distinguished burlesque writer. Born about A.D. 1500, he became a Cordelier, led a scandalous life, became a Benedictine, forsook the monastic life in 1530, and studied physic; was employed as a physician and librarian, by cardinal *Du Bellay;* went to Rome, returned, and was curate of *Meudon* from the year 1545, till his death in 1553. His works, consisting of his *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua,* are comic satires, full of the burlesque; and were printed in 5 vols. 8vo, Amsterd., 1715; and 3 vols. 4to, ibid, 1741. His satire of the monks excited their enmity, and caused him trouble. But he does not appear to have been in speculation a deist, or a heretic; though his piety may be justly questioned.—Montagne was a French nobleman, born in 1533, well educated in the classics at Bourdeaux; succeeded to the lordship of Montagne in Perigord, and to the mayoralty of Bourdeaux, where he ended his life A.D. 1592. His great work is, his Essays, often printed in 3 vols. 4to, and 6 vols. 12mo. He there appears to be skeptical in regard to scientific or philosophical morals, but he was a firm believer in revelation, which he regarded as man's only safe guide. See *Stäudlin,* l. c., p. 606, &c.—Des Perieres was a valet de chambre to *Margaret* queen of Navarre, and was a wit and a poet. A volume of his French poems was published after his death, which was in 1544. Previous to his death, he published in French a pretended translation of a Latin

Nay, some tell us, that in certain parts of France and Italy there were schools opened, from which issued swarms of such monsters. And no one

work, entitled Cymbalum mundi; which consists of four dialogues not very chaste, ridiculing the pagan superstitions in the manner of *Lucian*. See *Bayle*, l. c., art. *Perieres*.—Dolet was a man of learning, though indiscreet and much involved in controversies. After various changes, he became a printer and bookseller at Lyons; and having avowed lax sentiments in religion, he was seized by the Inquisition and burned, upon the charge of atheism A.D. 1546, at the age of 37. What his religious opinions were, it is not easy to state. He professed to be a Lutheran. See *Bayle*, l. c., art. *Dolet;* and *Rees'* Cyclopædia.—Peter Charron was born at Paris in 1541, studied and practised law several years, and then became a Catholic preacher in very high estimation for his pulpit talents. He died at Paris, A.D. 1603. He was a philosophical divine, bold and skeptical. He did not discard revelation, yet relied more upon natural religion. His most noted work was, de la Sagesse, in three books; first printed at Bourdeaux, 1601. See *Bayle*, l. c., art. *Charron;* and *Stäudlin*, l. c., p. 612, &c.—Leo X. was a man of pleasure, and gave no evidence of genuine piety. *Du Plessis* and other Protestants have reported remarks said to have been made by him in his unguarded moments, implying that he considered the Christian religion a fable, though a profitable one; that he doubted the immortality of the soul, &c. See *Bayle*, l. c., art. *Leo* X., note (1), p. 83. —Bembus was secretary to *Leo* X., a man of letters, a facetious companion, a poet and historian. He also is reported to have spoken equivocally of a future state, and to have despised *Paul's* epistles, on account of their unpolished style. See *Bayle*, l. c., art. *Bembus*, and art. *Melancthon*, note (P).—Politian was a learned classic scholar in the preceding century, and is reported to have said that he never read the Bible but once, and he considered *that* a loss of time. He was also reported to have given the preference to *Pindar's* poems, before those of *David*. On these rumours, he has been classed among freethinkers. See *Bayle*, l. c., art. *Polatian*.—Jordan Brunus was a Neapolitan freethinker. He attacked the Aristotelian philosophy, and denied many of the plain truths of revelation. Driven from Italy for his impieties, he travelled and resided in Germany, France, and England; and returning to Italy, he was committed to the flames in the year 1600. See *Bayle*, article *Brunus*.—Bernardin Ochin was an Italian, born in 1487 at Sienna. He early became a Franciscan, first of the class called Cordeliers, and then a Capuchin, of which last order he was the general from A.D. 1537–1542. He was then a very austere monk, and a distinguished preacher. But in the year 1541, meeting with *John Valdes* a Spanish civilian, who had accompanied *Charles* V. to Germany and there imbibed Lutheran sentiments, *Ochin* was converted to the same faith. The change in his views soon became known; and he was summoned to Rome to give account of himself. On his way thither he met with *Peter Martyr*, a man of kindred views, and they both agreed to flee beyond the reach of the papal power. They went first to Geneva, and thence to Augsburg, where *Ochin* published a volume of sermons, married, and lived from 1542 till 1547. From Augsburg, both *Ochin* and *Martyr* were invited into England by archbishop *Cranmer*, and were employed in reforming that country. But on the accession of queen *Mary* in 1553, they were obliged to quit England. *Ochin* returned to Strasburg, and in 1555 went to Basle, and thence to Zurich, where he became pastor to a congregation of Italian Protestants till 1563. He then published a volume of dialogues, in one of which he represented polygamy as lawful in certain cases, and advanced some other opinions which gave offence. The magistrates of Zurich banished him from the canton. He retired to Basle in mid-winter, and being refused an asylum there, he travelled with his family to Poland, where he met the like reception, and set out for Moravia; on his way, he and family were taken sick, two sons and a daughter died, he recovered so far as to pursue his journey, but died three weeks after, at Slawkaw, A.D. 1564, aged 77. He is said to have impugned the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Antitrinitarians claim him as one of their sect. His works were all written in Italian, and consisted of six volumes of sermons, commentaries on the epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, a treatise on the Lord's supper, another on predestination and free-will, &c. See *Bayle*, l. c., art. *Ochin*.—Theophrastus, or, as he called himself, *Philippus Aureolus Theophrastus Paracelsus Bombastus von Hohenheim*, was a vain, unlearned, but ingenious alchymist, physician, and philosopher of Switzerland, born in 1493. He travelled much, was a short time professor of physic at Basle, and died at Saltsburg in 1541. He was the father of the sect of *Theosophists*, a sort of mystics who pretended to derive all their knowledge of nature immediately from God. See *Rees'* Cy-

who is well acquainted with the state of those times, will reject these statements in the gross; for all the persons that are charged expressly with so great a crime, cannot be acquitted altogether. Yet if the subject be examined by impartial and competent judges, it will appear that many individuals were unjustly impeached, and others merited slighter reprobation.

§ 6. That all the arts and sciences were in this age advanced to a higher degree of perfection, by the ingenuity and zeal of eminent men, no one needs to be informed. From this happy revival of general learning, the whole Christian population of Europe derived very great advantages to themselves, and afterwards imparted advantages to other nations, even to the remotest parts of the world. Princes and states perceiving the vast utility of this progress of knowledge, were every where at much expense and pains to found and protect learned associations and institutions, to foster and encourage genius and talent, and to provide honours and rewards for literary and scientific men. From this time onward that salutary rule took effect, which still prevails among the larger and better part of the Christian community, of excluding all ignorant and illiterate persons from the sacred office and its functions. Yet the old contest between piety and learning, did not cease; for extensively, both among the adherents to the Roman pontiff and among his foes, there were persons,—good men perhaps, but not duly considerate,—who contended more zealously than ever, that religion and piety could not possibly live and be vigorous, unless all human learning and philosophy were separated from it, and the holy simplicity of the early ages restored.

§ 7. In the first rank among the learned of that age, were those who devoted themselves to editing, correcting, and explaining the ancient Greek and Latin authors, to the study of antiquities, to the cultivation of both those languages, and to elegant composition both in prose and verse. Numerous works still exist, the admiration of the learned, from which it appears, that the finest geniuses in all parts of Europe, prosecuted these branches of learning with the greatest ardour, and even considered the preservation of religion and civil institutions and the very life of all solid learning to depend on these studies. And though some of them might go too far in this thing, yet no candid man will deny, that the prosecution of these studies first opened the way for mental cultivation, and rescued both reason and religion from bondage.

§ 8. Those who devoted themselves principally to the study and improvement of philosophy, were indeed less numerous than the prosecutors of elegant literature, yet they formed a body neither small nor contemptible. They were divided into two classes. The one laboured to discover the nature and truth of things, solely by contemplation or speculation; the other recurred also to experiments. The former either followed their chosen guides and masters, or they struck out new paths by their own ingenuity and efforts. Those who followed masters, either fixed their eye

clopædia, and *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. iii., p. 145, &c.—Tauretlus (*Œchslein*), a philosopher and physician of Mompelgard, who taught at Basle and Altorf, lived at a time when *Aristotle* reigned with boundless sway in all the universities; and wishing to free himself from the tyranny of the Stagyrite, he ventured as a man of independence to correct some of *Aristotle's* opinions concerning God, providence, the human soul, &c. He thus became embroiled with the friends of *Aristotle* as his opposers, and was suspected of atheism. But *Dr. Feurlein* has defended him, in a Dissert. apologetica. See *Schlegel's* note.—*Tr.*]

on *Plato*, (to whom many in Italy especially gave the preference), or they followed *Aristotle*. The professed followers of *Aristotle* were moreover, greatly divided among themselves. For while many of them wished to preserve the old method of philosophizing, which, by the doctors that still reigned in the schools, was falsely called the peripatetic; others wished to see *Aristotle* taught pure and uncontaminated, that is, they wished to have his works themselves brought forward and explained to the youth. Different from both, were those who thought, that the marrow only should be extracted from the lucubrations of *Aristotle*, and when illumined with the light of elegant literature and corrected by the dictates of reason and sound theology, should thus be exhibited in appropriate treatises. At the head of this last class of peripatetics, was our *Philip Melancthon*. Among those discarding the dogmas of the ancients and philosophizing freely, were *Jerome Cardanus*, *Bernhard Telesius*, and *Thomas Campanella;* men of great and splendid genius, yet too much devoted to the fictions and visions of their own fancies. To these may be added *Peter Ramus*, an ingenious and acute Frenchman, who excited great commotion and clamour, by publishing a new art of reasoning opposed to that of *Aristotle* and better accommodated to the use of orators. From nature itself, by experiment, by inspection, and by the aid of fire, penetrating into the primary elements of things, *Theophrastus Paracelsus* endeavoured to discover and demonstrate latent truths. And his example was so approved by many, that a new sect of philosophers soon rose up, who assumed the names of *Fire Philosophers* and *Theosophists*, and who, attributing very little to human reason and reflection, ascribed every thing to experience and divine illumination.(11)

§ 9. These efforts and competitions among men of genius, besides being highly beneficial in many other respects, corrected in several places, though they did not entirely cure, that barbarous, uncouth, and vile method of treating religious subjects which had prevailed among Christians in the preceding centuries. The holy scriptures, which had been either wholly neglected or interpreted very unsuitably, now held a far more conspicuous place in the discussions and the writings of theologians; both words and things were more critically examined, subjects were more justly and lucidly analyzed, and the dry and insipid style which the old schools admired, was exploded by all the better informed. These improvements were not indeed carried so far, that nothing was left for succeeding ages to correct and amend: much remained that was imperfect. Yet he must be ungrateful to the men of that age, or a very incompetent judge, who shall deny, that they laid the foundation of all those excellences by which the theologians of subsequent times are distinguished from those of the former ages.

§ 10. Hence the true nature and genius of the Christian religion, which even the best and most learned had not before sufficiently understood, were placed in a clearer light, being drawn up as it were from a deep pit. There is indeed error enough, still existing every where; yet even those Christian communities at this day, whose errors are the greatest and most numerous, have not such crude and inconsistent views of the nature and design of Christianity and of the duties and obligations of Christians, as were formerly entertained even by those who claimed to be rulers of the church

(11) For the elucidation of these matters *James Brucker's* Historia Philosophiæ critica, will be found very useful. We here only summarily touch upon the subject.

and chief among its teachers. This improved state of religion, moreover, had great influence in correcting and softening the manners of many nations, who before were coarse, unpolished, and rude. For although it is not to be denied, that other causes also contributed gradually to introduce and establish that milder and more cultivated state of society which has prevailed in most countries of Europe since the times of *Luther*, yet it is very clear, that the religious discussions and the better knowledge of many doctrines and duties to which they gave rise, have contributed very much to eradicate from the minds of men their former ferocity of character. Nor shall we go wide of the truth when we add, that since that time genuine piety likewise has had more friends and cultivators; though they have always and every where, been overwhelmed by the multitude of the ungodly.

SECTION III.

THE PARTICULAR HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

PART I.

THE HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORY OF THE ROMISH OR LATIN CHURCH.

§ 1. The Roman Pontiff, and his Election.—§ 2. His Power circumscribed.—§ 3. Disagreement respecting it.—§ 4. Diminution of the Romish Church.—§ 5. Plans of the Pontiffs for remedying this Evil. Missions.—§ 6. The Egyptians and Armenians.—§ 7, 8. Nestorians. Indians.—§ 9. Internal State of the Romish Church regulated and fixed.—§ 10. Loyola, the Founder of the Jesuits.—§ 11. Nature and Character of this Order.—§ 12. Its Zeal for the Pontiffs.—§ 13. The Roman Pontiffs.—§ 14. The Clergy.—§ 15. Their Lives.—§ 16. The Monks. Old Orders reformed.—§ 17, 18. New Orders.—§ 19. The State of Learning.—§ 20. Philosophy.—§ 21. Theological Writers.—§ 22. Principles of the Romish Religion.—§ 23. The Council of Trent.—§ 24. Substance of the Catholic Faith.—§ 25. Exegetic Theology.—§ 26. Interpreters of Scripture.—§ 27. Dogmatic Theology.—§ 28. Practical Theology.—§ 29. Polemic Theology.—§ 30. Controversies in the Romish Church.—§ 31. Their greater Controversies.—§ 32. First Controversy.—§ 33. The second.—§ 34. The third.—§ 35. The fourth.—§ 36. The fifth.—§ 37. The sixth.—§ 38. Controversy with Michael Baius.—§ 39. Controversy with the Jesuits, Less and Hamel.—§ 40. Molinist Controversy.—§ 41. Congregations on the Aids.—§ 42. Ceremonies and Rites.

§ 1. The Romish or Latin church is a community extending very widely over the world, the whole of which is subject to the single bishop of Rome; who claims to be hereditary successor to the office and to all the prerogatives of *St. Peter*, the prince of the apostles, or the supreme bishop of the Christian church universal, and the legate and vicegerent of *Jesus Christ*.

This mighty prelate is chosen, at this day, by a select number of the Romish clergy; namely, by six *bishops* in the vicinage of Rome, fifty rectors or *presbyters* of churches in Rome, and fourteen overseers or *deacons* of Romish hospitals or *deaconries;* all of whom are called by the ancient appellation of *cardinals*. These *cardinals*, when deliberating respecting the choice of a new pontiff, are shut up in a kind of prison which is called the *conclave*, that they may the more expeditiously bring the difficult business to a close. No one, who is not a member of the college of *cardinals* and also a native Italian, can be made head of the church; nor can all those, who are Italian cardinals.(1) Some are excluded on account of their birthplace, others on account of their course of life, and others for other causes. Moreover the German Roman emperors, and the kings of France and Spain, have acquired either legally or by custom, the right of excluding those they disapprove from the list of candidates for this high office. Hence, there are very few in the great body of cardinals, who are *papable*, as the common phrase is; that is, who are so born and of such characteristics, that the august functions of a *pope* can fall to their lot.

§ 2. The Roman pontiff does not enjoy a power which has no limitations or restraints. For whatever he decrees in the sacred republic, he must decree in accordance with the advice of the *brethren*, that is of the *cardinals*, who are his counsellors and ministers of state. In questions of a religious nature likewise, and in theological controversies, he must take the opinion and judgment of theologians. The minor matters of business moreover, are distributed into several species, and committed to the man-

(1) The reader may consult *Jo. Fred. Mayer's* Comment. de electione Pontif. Roman., Hamb., 1691, 4to. The ceremoniale electionis et coronationis Pontificis Romani, was not long since published by *Jo. Gerh. Meuschen*, Frankf., 1732, 4to. [To be eligible, 1st. A man must be of mature age; for the electors then hope, that their turn may come to be elected. Besides, a pope 50 or more years old, will be more likely to rule discreetly and sagaciously. 2dly. He must be an Italian; for a foreigner might remove the papal residence out of the country. 3dly. He must not be the subject of any distinguished prince, but must be a native subject of the holy see; for otherwise he might promote the interests of his hereditary prince, to the injury of the holy see. 4thly. Monks are not readily preferred; lest they should confer too many privileges on their own order. 5thly. Nor are those who have been ministers of state, ambassadors, or pensioners of distinguished princes. 6thly. Nor such as have been much engaged in political affairs. 7thly. No one who has numerous relatives, especially poor ones; on whom he might exhaust the apostolical treasury. From these causes, the choice generally falls at the present day, upon either learned or devout popes.—There are four methods of choosing a pope. I. By *scrutiny;* that is by ballot. A golden cup is placed on the altar, into which each cardinal casts a sealed vote; and to make out a regular choice, one man must have the suffrages of two thirds of the cardinals. II. *By accession.* This method is resorted to, when a candidate has many votes, but not enough to constitute a choice, and a trial is made to bring some of the other cardinals to *accede* to his election. It is properly a new scrutiny, though the ballots are of a different form. III. *By compromise;* that is, when the conclave continues long, and the cardinals cannot agree, they transfer the election to two or three cardinals, and agree to abide by their choice. IV. *By inspiration.* When the cardinals have become weary of their long confinement, sometimes one or more of them will clamorously announce an individual as pope, and the party in his favour being previously apprized of the measure, join in the outcry, till the cardinals in opposition, through fear, join in the general clamour. A pope thus chosen by *inspiration*, is particularly revered by the Italians, notwithstanding their belief that there can be no election by inspiration, unless the cardinals have previously conducted foolishly.—*Schl.* See also *Rees'* Cyclopædia, art. Conclave: and the *Ceremonial* of the election of a pontiff, ratified by *Gregory* XV., A D. 1622, in the Bullarium Magnum, tom. iii., p. 454-465.—*Tr.*]

agement and trust of certain boards of commissioners called *congregations*, over which one or more cardinals preside.(2) What these boards deem salutary or right, is ordinarily approved by the pontiff; and *must* be approved, unless there are very cogent reasons for the contrary. From such a constitution of the sacred republic, many things must often take place far otherwise than would meet the wishes of the pontiff; nor are those well informed as to the management of affairs at Rome, who suppose that he who presides there, is the cause of all the evils, all the faults, all the contests and commotions that occur there.(3)

(2) The court of Rome is minutely described by *Jac. Aymon*, in a book entitled, Tableau de la Cour de Rome, Hague, 1707, 8vo; and by *Jerome Limadoro*, Relation de la Cour de Rome, et des Ceremonies qui s'y observent, which (translated from the Italian into French) *Jo. Bapt. Labat* has subjoined to his Travels in Spain and Italy; Voyages en Espagne et Italie, tome viii., p. 105, &c. On the Romish congregations or colleges, besides *Dorotheus Asc*ianus, (de Montibus pietatis Romanis, p. 510, &c.), *Hunold Plettenburg* has a particular treatise, Notitia tribunalium et congregationum curiæ Romanæ, Hildesh., 1693, 8vo.—[The congregations are properly boards of commissioners, meeting at stated times, with full and definitive powers within certain limits, to decide summarily all controversies, and to control and manage all business that falls within their respective provinces. They have their own secretaries, keep records of their proceedings, may send for persons and papers, call on professional and learned men for their opinions, and are bound in certain cases to consult the pontiff before they come to a decision. The number and the specific duties of the several congregations, vary from time to time, as the pope and his council see fit to ordain. Besides these permanent congregations, others are created for special occasions, and expire when their business is closed. *Sixtus* V. in the year 1587, established fifteen permanent congregations, composed most of them of five cardinals each, and none of them of less than three. They were, I. The congregation of the holy Inquisition; the supreme inquisitorial tribunal for all Christendom. In this the pope presided in person. II. The congregation on letters of grace, dispensations, &c. III. The congregation on the erection, union, and dismemberment, of churches, bishoprics, &c. IV. The congregation for supplying the ecclesiastical states with corn, and preventing scarcity. V. The congregation on sacred rites and ceremonies. VI. The congregation for providing and regulating a papal fleet, to consist of ten ships. VII. The congregation on the Index of prohibited books. VIII. The congregation for interpreting and executing the decrees of the council of Trent, except as to the articles of faith. IX. The congregation for relief, in cases of oppression in the ecclesiastical states. X. The congregation on the university of Rome; with a general inspection of all Catholic seminaries. XI. The congregation on the different orders of monks. XII. The congregation to attend to the applications of bishops and other prelates. XIII. The congregation on the roads, bridges, and aqueducts of the Romish territory. XIV. The congregation for superintending the Vatican printing establishment. XV. The congregation on the applications of all citizens of the ecclesiastical states, in civil and criminal matters. See the ordinance establishing these several congregations, in the Bullarium Magnum, tom. ii., p. 677, &c. Considerable alterations were afterwards made, as to the number, duties, and powers of the Romish congregations.—*Tr.*]

(3) Hence originated that important distinction, which the French and others who have had contests with the Roman pontiffs very frequently make, between the *Roman pontiff*, and the *Romish court*. The *court* is often severely censured, while the pontiff is spared, and that justly. For the fathers and the congregations, who possess rights which the pontiff must not infringe, plot and effect many things, without the knowledge and against the will of the pontiff.—[It may be worthy of remark, that although the Romish church is a political body, which is governed like other kingdoms and states, yet in this commonwealth every thing is called by a different name. The ghostly king, is called the *pope* or *father*; his ministers of state are called *cardinals*; his envoys of the highest rank, are called *legates a latere*, and those of a lower order, *apostolical nuncios*. His chancery is called *dataria*; his boards of commissioners and judicatures, are *congregations*; his supreme court of justice, is named the *rota*; and his counsellors of state, are called *auditors of the rota* (auditores rotæ).—*Schl.*]

§ 3. Respecting the powers and prerogatives of this spiritual monarchy however, its own citizens disagree very much. And hence the authority of the Romish prelate and of his legates, is not the same in all countries; but in some it is more circumscribed and limited, in others more extensive and uncontrolled. The pontiff himself, indeed, as well as his courtiers and friends, claim for him the highest supremacy; for he contends not only that all spiritual power and majesty reside primarily in him alone, and are transmitted in certain portions from him to the inferior prelates, but also that his decisions made from the chair, are correct beyond even the suspicion of error. On the contrary very many, of whom the French are the most distinguished, maintain that a portion of spiritual jurisdiction emanating immediately from *Jesus Christ*, is possessed by each individual bishop; and that the whole resides in the pastors collectively, or in ecclesiastical councils duly called; while the pontiff, separately from the body of the church, is liable to err. This long controversy may be reduced to this simple question: Is the Romish prelate the *lawgiver* of the church, or only the *guardian* and *executor* of the laws enacted by Christ and by the church? Yet there is no prospect that this controversy will ever terminate, unless there should be a great revolution; because the parties are not agreed respecting the judge who is to decide it.(4)

§. 4. The Romish church lost much of its ancient splendour and glory, from the time that the native aspect of the Christian religion and church was portrayed, and exhibited before the nations of Europe, by the efforts of *Luther*. For many opulent countries of Europe withdrew themselves, some of them entirely and others in part, from adherence to its laws and institutions; and this defection greatly diminished the resources of the Roman pontiffs.(5) Moreover the kings and princes who chose not to abandon

(4) The arguments used by the friends of the pontifical claims, may be seen in *Robert Bellarmin*, and numerous others, who have written in accordance with the views of the pontiffs; and whose works form a huge collection, made by *Thomas Roccaberti*. Even among the French, *Matthew Petitdidier* lately defended the pontifical power, in his book Sur l'autorité et infallibilité des Papes, Luxembourg, 1724, 8vo. The arguments commonly employed to support the opinion adopted by the French clergy and by those who accord with them, may be best learned from various writings of *Edmund Richer* and *John Launoi*.

(5) [Yet the popes still have very considerable revenues, notwithstanding there is no country in the world where more beggars are to be met with than in the ecclesiastical states, and while the apostolical treasury is always very poor: for 1st. The pope has many clerical livings at his disposal; none of which are readily given away. In particular, he disposes of all the livings whose incumbents happen to die at his court; and also the livings of those that die in what are called the pontifical months. 2dly. He confirms the election to cathedral chapters by the spiritual founders, with his bulls of confirmation, which always cost large sums. 3dly. He draws the *annates*, or the incomes of the first year of incumbency, in bishoprics and archbishoprics. 4thly. He exacts a certain sum for the badge of spiritual knighthood in the Romish church, or for the *pallium* of archbishops and bishops. This is properly a neckcloth, which answers to the riband or garter of secular knighthood, and is worn by distinguished prelates when they say mass and on the other solemn occasions. 5thly. There are certain cases reserved for the popes, (*casus reservati*,) in which no father confessor can give absolution or a dispensation, and in which the granting dispensations brings a large revenue to the popes: for example, in matrimonial cases, in the relinquishment of the clerical office, monastic vows, &c. And finally, the pope has power to impose extraordinary payments and contributions on his clerical subjects; which are called *subsidies*. The monks also must pay an annual sum to the pope for his protection, which is called the *collects*. Thus the pope is in reality an opulent lord, even since the reformation; and he does not lack means for enriching

the old form of religion, learned from the writings and discussions of the *Protestants*, much more clearly and correctly than before, that the pontiffs had set up numberless claims without any right; and that if the pontifical power should remain such as it was before *Luther's* time, the civil governments could not possibly retain their dignity and majesty. And hence, partly by secret and artful measures, and partly by open opposition, they every where set bounds to the immoderate ambition of the pontiffs, who wished to control all things secular as well as sacred according to their own pleasure: nor did the pontiffs deem it prudent to avenge these darings, as formerly, by means of interdicts and crusades. Even the countries which still acknowledge the pontiff as the supreme lawgiver of the church, and as incapable of erring, (and which are called *countries of obedience*, terras obedientiæ,) nevertheless confine his legislative powers within narrower limits.

§ 5. To repair in some measure this very great loss, the pontiffs laboured much more earnestly than their predecessors had done, to extend the bounds of their kingdom out of Europe, both among the nations not Christian and among the Christian sects. In this very important business, first the Jesuits, and afterwards persons of the other monastic orders, were employed. Yet if we except the achievements of *Francis Xavier* and his associates in India, China, and Japan, which have been already noticed, very little that was great and splendid was accomplished in this century, the arrangements for this business being not yet perfected. The Portuguese having opened a passage to the Abyssinians who followed the dogmas and the rites of the Monophysites, there was a fine opportunity for attempts to bring that nation under subjection to the Romish see. Hence first, *John Bermudes* was sent to them decorated with the title of *patriarch* of the Abyssinians; and afterwards, this mission was committed to *Ignatius Loyola* and his associates.(6) Various circumstances, and especially the wars of the nation, which the Abyssinian emperor hoped to terminate favourably by the aid of the Portuguese, seemed at first to promise suc-

himself, notwithstanding his public treasury is always poor. For the disposal of all these sums is in his hands; and he can let a portion of them flow into his treasury, or he can bestow them on his relations and dependants, or apply them to establishments that will make his name immortal.—*Schl.*]

(6) [Friendly intercourse between the emperor of Abyssinia and the king of Portugal, commenced as early as the year 1514, when the former sent an ambassador to the latter. In 1521 the same emperor, *David*, sent an envoy to the pope at Rome; who returned a very kind answer. In 1545 *Claudius* the son of *David*, applied to *John* III. king of Portugal, to send him several priests and artists. The king applied to *Loyola*, to designate some of his followers for the enterprise. *Loyola* did so; and the pope ordained *John Nonius Barretus* of Portugal, patriarch of Abyssinia; *Andrew Oviedus* a Neapolitan, bishop of Nice; and *Melchior Cornerius* of Portugal, bishop of Hierapolis; the two last to be coadjutors and successors to *Barretus*. Ten other Jesuits of inferior rank, were joined with them. They all sailed from Portugal in the year 1555; but on their arrival at Goa, they found that the Abyssinian emperor *Claudius*, was not disposed to subject his kingdom to the pontiff. *Barretus* therefore stayed in India, where he was a successful missionary till his death. *Oviedus* went to Abyssinia with a few companions, and was there imprisoned. *Claudius* had been slain in battle in 1559, and his brother and successor *Adamus*, was a violent persecutor of the Christians. After twenty years labour in Abyssinia, *Oviedus* died A.D. 1577. His companions died one after another, till, in the year 1597, *Francis Lupus* the last of them expired, and left the handful of Catholics without a priest. See *Nic. Godignus*, de Abassinorum rebus, deque Æthiopiæ Patriarchis, Jo. Non. Barreto et Andr. Oviedo., Lugd., 1615, 8vo, and *Od. Raynald's* Annales Eccles. on the years specified.—*Tr.*]

cess to the enterprise. But in process of time it appeared, that the attachment of the Abyssinians to the principles of their progenitors was too strong to be eradicated; and with the close of this century, the Jesuits nearly lost all hope of success among them.(7)

§ 6. To the Copts or Egyptians, who were closely connected with the Abyssinians in religion and ecclesiastical customs, *Christopher Roderic*, a famous Jesuit, was sent by authority of *Pius* IV. in the year 1562. He returned to Rome with nothing but fair words, although he had laboured to overcome *Gabriel*, then the patriarch of Alexandria, with very rich presents and with subtle arguments.(8) But near the close of the century, in the year 1594, when *Clement* VIII. was head of the Romish church, the envoys of an Alexandrian patriarch whose name was likewise *Gabriel*, appeared as suiters at Rome; which caused very great exultation at the time among the friends of the Romish court.(9) But this embassy is justly suspected by ingenuous men even of the Romish community; and it was probably contrived by the Jesuits, for the purpose of persuading the Abyssinians, who generally followed the example of the Alexandrians, to embrace more readily the communion of the Roman pontiff.(10) Nothing certainly occurred afterwards in Egypt, to indicate any partiality of the Copts towards the Romans.—A part of the Armenians had long manifested a veneration for the Roman pontiff, without however quitting the institutions and rites of their fathers; of which more will be said when we come to the history of the Oriental church. A larger accession was anticipated from *Serapion* a man of wealth and devoted to the Romans, who, though the Armenians had two patriarchs already, was created a third patriarch in the year 1593, in order to free his nation from oppressive debt. But he was soon after sent into exile by the Persian monarch, at the instigation of the other Armenians; and with him all the delightful anticipations of the Romans came to nothing.(11)

§ 7. In the year 1551, a great contest arose among the Nestorians, or Chaldeans as they are called, respecting the election of a new patriarch; one party demanding *Simeon Barmamas*, and another *Sulaka*. The latter

(7) See *Job Ludolf's* Historia Æthiopica; and the notes on that history, passim. *Mich. Geddes*, Church History of Ethiopia, p. 120, &c. *Henry le Grand's* Diss. de la conversion des Abyssins, p. 25, which is the ninth of the Diss subjoined to *Jerome Lobo's* Voyage Historique d'Abyssinie; *Matth. Veyss. la Croze*, Histoire du Christianisme en Ethiopie, liv. ii., p. 90, &c.

(8) *Franc. Sachinus*, Historia Societat. Jesu, pt. ii., lib. v. *Euseb. Renaudot*, Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrin., p. 611. And especially, the Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus, tom. ii., p. 314, &c.

(9) The documents of this embassy, emblazoned with a splendid exordium, are subjoined by *Cæsar Baronius* to the sixth volume of his Annales Eccles., p. 707, &c. [p. 691–700], ed. Antwerp.

(10) *Eusebius Renaudot*, in his Historia Patriarchar. Alexandinor., p. 611, 612, has endeavoured to re-establish the credit of this embassy which *Baronius* so exultingly extols. But he errs very much when he supposes, that only *Richard Simon* relying on the fallacious testimony of *George Dousa*, has opposed it. For *Thomas a Jesu* a Carmelite, did so; lib. vi. de conversione omnium gentium procuranda; and others have done so. See *Mich. Geddes*, Church History of Ethiopia, p. 231, 232. [Whoever reads the documents must be sensible that they all bear the marks of being the composition of *one* person, though they profess to be the letters of several different persons. The reader will also be surprised to find how perfectly at home the writer seems to be, when trumpeting the claims of the pontiff to universal lordship, and when detailing the affairs of the Romish church.—*Tr.*]

(11) See the Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus dans le Levant, tom. iii., p. 132, 133.

made a journey to Rome, and was there consecrated in the year 1553, by *Julius* III., to whom he swore allegiance. *Julius* gave to this new patriarch of the Chaldeans the name of *John;* and sent with him on his return to his country, several persons well skilled in the Syrian language, for the purpose of establishing the Romish dominion among the Nestorians. From that time onward the Nestorians became split into two factions; and were often brought into the most imminent peril, by the opposing interests and contests of their patriarchs.(12) The Nestorians on the seacoast of India, who are commonly called the *Christians of St. Thomas,* were cruelly harassed by the Portuguese, to induce them to exchange the religion of their fathers which was much more simple than the Roman, for the Romish worship. The consummation of this business was reserved for *Alexius Menezes,* archbishop of Goa; who near the close of the century, with the aid of the Jesuits, compelled those miserable, reluctating, and unwilling people, by means of amazing severities, to come under the power of the Roman pontiff. These violent proceedings of *Menezes* and his associates, have met the disapprobation of persons distinguished for wisdom and equity in the Romish community.(13)

§ 8. Most of these missionaries of the Roman pontiff, treated the Christians whom they wished to overcome, unkindly and unreasonably. For they not only required them to give up the opinions in which they differed from both the Greek and the Latin churches, and to recognise the bishop of Rome as a lawgiver and vicegerent of Christ on the earth; but they also opposed sentiments that deserved toleration, nay, such as were sound and consonant to the scriptures; insisted on the abrogation of customs, rites, and institutions, that had come down from former times, and were not prejudicial to the truth; and in short, required their entire worship to be conducted after the Romish fashion. The Romish court indeed found at length by experience, that such a mode of proceeding was indiscreet, and that it was not suited to the successful extension of the empire of the pontiff. Accordingly the great business of missions came gradually to be conducted in a more wise and temperate manner; and the missionaries were directed to make it their sole object, to bring these Christians to become subjects of the pontiff, and to renounce professedly at least such opinions as had been condemned by the ecclesiastical councils; while all other things, doctrines as well as the practices of their fathers, were to remain inviolate. And this plan was supported by certain learned divines, who endeavoured to prove though not always successfully and fairly, that there was but little difference between the doctrines of the Greek and other Oriental Christians and those of the Romish church, provided they were estimated correctly and truly, and not according to the artificial definitions and subtleties of the Scholastic doctors. This plan of using moderation, was more serviceable to the Romish interests than the old plan of severity, yet it did not produce all the effects its authors anticipated.

§ 9. In guarding and fortifying the church against the attacks and wiles

(12) *Jos. Simon Asseman's* Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementina-Vaticana, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. clxiv. See below, in the history of the Oriental church.

(13) *Matt. Veyss. la Croze,* Histoire du Christianisme des Indes, livr. ii., p. 88, &c. [*Claud. Buchanan's* Christian Researches in Asia, p. 85, &c. *M. Geddes,* Hist. of the Malabar Church, Lond., 1694, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

of adversaries without and adversaries within, no little pains were taken at Rome, from the age of *Luther* onward. For that most effectual method of subduing heretics, by *crusades*, being laid aside on account of the altered state not only of the Romish authority but of all Europe, recourse to other means and other policy for preserving the church, became necessary. Hence the terrible tribunals of the *Inquisition*, in the countries where they were admitted, were fortified and regulated by new provisions. Colleges were erected here and there, in which young men were trained by continual practice, to the best methods of disputing with the adversaries of the pope. The ingress into the church of books that might corrupt the minds of its members, was prevented or rendered extremely difficult, by means of what were called *expurgatory and prohibitory indices*, drawn up by the most sagacious men. The cultivation of literature was earnestly recommended to the clergy, and high rewards were held out to those who aspired to pre-eminence in learning. The young were much more solidly instructed in the precepts and first principles of religion, than before: and many other means for the safety of the church were adopted. Thus the greatest evils often produce the greatest benefits. And the advantages arising from these and other regulations, would not perhaps quite to the present times have been realized by the Romish church, if the heretics had not boldly invaded and laid waste her territories.

§ 10. As the Roman pontiffs were accustomed to control, defend, and enlarge their empire principally by means of the religious orders [or monks], who from various causes are more closely connected with the pontiffs than the other clergy and the bishops, it became very necessary, after the unsuccessful contest with *Luther*, that some new order should be established, wholly devoted to the pontifical interests, and making it their great business to recover if possible what was lost, to repair what was injured, and to fortify and guard what remained entire. For the two orders of *Mendicants*, [the Dominicans and Franciscans], by whom especially the pontiffs had governed the church for some centuries with the best effects, had from several causes lost no small part of their reputation and influence, and therefore could not subserve the interests of the church as efficiently and successfully as heretofore. Such a new society as the necessities of the church demanded, was found in that noted and most powerful order, which assumed a name from *Jesus*, and was commonly called the society of the *Jesuits;* but by its enemies it was named the society of *Loyolites*, or (from the Spanish name of its founder) the *Inighists.*(14) The founder of it, *Ignatius Loyola*, was a Spanish knight, first a soldier and then a fanatic,

(14) The principal writers concerning the order of Jesuits, are enumerated by *Christopher Aug. Salig*, Historia Augustanæ Confessionis, tom. ii., p. 73, &c. [Of these, the most valuable as general works, are the following: Historia Societatis Jesu, to the year 1625, in 6 vols. fol., by members of the society: viz., part i. by *Nic. Orlandinus*, Ant., 1620; part ii. by *Fr. Sacchinus*, ibid.; part iii. and iv. by the same, Rome, 1649, 1652; part v. by *Pet. Possinus* and *Jos. Juvencius*, Rome, 1661 and 1710; part vi. by *Jul. Cordaro*, Rome, 1750. Also, Histoire des religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus, &c. (by *Pierre Quesne*, surnommé *Bénard*, to A.D. 1572), ed. 2d, Utretcht, 1741, 3 vols. 12mo. Histoire generale de la naissance et des progrès de la Comp. de Jesus (by *Christoph. Coudrette* and *Louis Adr. le Paige*) 6. vols. 12mo, Amsterd., 1761, 1767. Essay of a new history of the order of Jesuits (in German: to 1565), Berlin and Halle, 1769, 1770, 2 vols. 8vo; General Hist. of the Jesuits from the rise of the order to the present time (in Germ.), by *Pet. Phil. Wolf*, ed. 2d, Lips., 1803, 4 vols. 8vo. Pragmatic Hist. of the order of Jesuits from their origin to the present time, (in Germ.), by *Jo. Chr.*

an illiterate man, but of an exuberant imagination.(15) After various changes, he went to Rome, and it is said, was there trained by the in-

Harenberg, Halle, 1760, 2 vols. 4to. The two last are considered the best summaries. —*Tr.*]

(15) Many biographies of *Loyola* have been composed by his followers; most of which are rather eulogies of the man, than simple correct statements of facts. They transmute common events into prodigies. [Of this class is *Jo. Pet. Maffei*, de vita et moribus B. P. Ignatii Loyolæ; Douay, 1661, 12mo. —*Schl.*] Recently a Frenchman, who calls himself *Hercules Rasuel de Selve*, [an anagram of his real name, *Charles le Vier*, a bookseller at the Hague.—*Tr.*], has composed a history of *Loyola*, with a good degree of ingenuousness, if we except his own witty remarks. It is divided into two parts, and entitled: Histoire de l'admirable Dom *Inigo* de Guipuscoa, (which is the Spanish name of *Ignatius*), Chevalier de la vierge et Fondateur de la Monarchie de Inighistes; printed at the Hague, 1736, and again 1739, 8vo.—[*Ignatius Loyola* was born at the castle of Loyola, in the district of Guipuscoa, in Biscay, Spain, A.D. 1491. Trained up in ignorance and in vice, at the court of Ferdinand and Isabella, he early became a soldier, and bravely commanded Pampeluna, when besieged by the French in 1521. Here he had his leg broken; and during a long confinement, amused himself with reading romances. A Spanish legend of certain saints being put into his hands, led him to renounce the world, and become a saint. He first visited the shrine of the holy virgin, at Montserrat in Catalonia; hung his arms on her altar, and devoted himself to her, as her knight, March 24th, 1522. He next went in the garb of a pilgrim, to Manresa, and spent a year among the poor in the hospital. Here he wrote his Spiritual Exercises, a book which was not printed till many years after. He next set out for the Holy Land. From Barcelona he sailed to Italy, obtained the blessing of the pope, proceeded to Venice, and embarked for Joppa, where he arrived in August, and reached Jerusalem in Sept., 1523. After satisfying his curiosity, he returned by Venice and Genoa to Barcelona, where he commenced the study of Latin, and at the end of two years or A.D. 1526, removed to Alcala, (Complutum), and commenced reading philosophy. His strange appearance and manner of life rendered him suspected, and caused him to be apprehended by the inquisitors. They released him however, on condition that he should not attempt to give religious instruction till after four years' study. Unwilling to submit to this restraint, he went to Salamanca; and pursuing the same course there, he was again apprehended, and laid under the same restriction. He therefore went to Paris, where he arrived Feb., 1528. Here he lived by begging, spent much time in giving religious exhortations, and prosecuted a course of philosophy and theology. Several young men of a kindred spirit, (among whom was the celebrated *Francis Xavier*, the apostle of the Indies), united with him in a kind of monastic association, in 1534. At first they were but seven in number, but they increased to ten. At length they agreed to leave Paris, and to meet in January, 1537, at Venice. Loyola went to Spain to settle some affairs; preached there with great effect, and at the time appointed joined his associates at Venice. As they purposed to perform a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, they went to Rome to obtain the papal benediction, and returned to Venice. But the war with the Turks now suspended all intercourse with Palestine, and they could not obtain a passage. Not to be idle, they dispersed themselves over the country, and preached everywhere. Rome now became their place of rendezvous. While thus employed, *Ignatius* conceived the idea of forming a new and peculiar order of monks. His companions came into the plan; and in 1540, they applied to *Paul* III., who confirmed their institution with some limitations, and afterwards, in 1543, without those limitations. *Loyola* was chosen general of the order in 1541. He resided constantly at Rome, while his companions spread themselves everywhere, labouring to convert Jews and heretics, to reform the vicious, and inspire men with a religious spirit. His sect increased rapidly; and among the new members, were three females. But they gave *Loyola* so much trouble, that he applied to the pope for a decree releasing them from their vow, and ordaining that the society should never be cumbered with female members any more. After obtaining a confirmation of his order in 1550, from *Julius* III., he wished to resign his generalship over it; but his associates would not consent, and he remained their general till his death, July 31st, 1556. He was beatified by *Paul* V. A.D. 1609, and enrolled among the saints by *Gregory* XV. A.D. 1622. When *Loyola* died, his society consisted of over 1000 persons; who possessed about 100 houses, and were divided into 12 provinces, Italy, Sicily, Germany, the Netherlands, France, Aragon, Castile, the south of Spain, Portugal and

structions and councils of certain wise and acute men, so that he was enabled to found such a society as the state of the church then required.(16)

§ 11. The *Jesuits* hold an intermediate place between the *monks* and the *secular clergy*, and approach near to the order of *regular canons*. For while they live secluded from the multitude and are under vows, like monks, yet they are exempted from the most onerous duties of *monks*, the canonical hours, and the like; in order that they may have more time for the instruction of youth, for writing books, guiding the minds of the religious, and other services useful to the church. The whole society is divided into three classes; namely, the *professors*, who live in *houses of the professors;* the *Scholastics*, who teach youth in their *colleges;* and the *novices*, who reside in the houses erected especially for them. The *professors*, in addition to the three common vows of monks, are bound by a fourth, by which they engage before God that they will instantly go wherever the Roman pontiff shall at any time bid them; and they have no revenues, or are *Mendicants* and live on the bounties of the pious. The others, and especially the residents in the *colleges*, have very ample possessions, and must afford assistance when necessary to the *professors*. If compared with the other classes, the *professors* are few in number, and are generally men of prudence, skilful in business, of much experience, learned,—in a word, true and perfect Jesuits. The others are Jesuits only in a looser sense of the term; and are rather *associates* of the Jesuits, than real Jesuits. The mysteries of the society are imparted only to a few of the *professors*, aged men, of long experience, and of the most tried characters; the rest are entirely ignorant of them.(17)

Brazil, Ethiopia, and the East Indies. See *Bayle*, Dict. hist. crit., article Loyola, and *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. iii., p. 515, &c.—*Tr.*]

(16) Not only Protestants but also many Roman Catholics, and they men of learning and discrimination, deny that *Loyola* had learning enough to compose the writings ascribed to him, or genius enough to form such a society as originated from him. On the contrary, they say, that some very wise and superior men guided and controlled his mind; and that better educated men than he, composed the works which bear his name. See *Mich. Geddes*, Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. iii., p. 429. Most of his writings are supposed to have been produced by *Jo. de Palanco*, his secretary. See *M. V. la Croze*, Histoire du Christ. d'Ethiopie, p. 55, 271. His spiritual Exercises (Exercitia Spiritualia), the Benedictines say, were transcribed from the work of a Spanish Benedictine, whose name was *Cisneros*. See *Jordan*, Vie de Mr. la Croze, p. 83, &c. The constitutions of the society, it is said, were drawn up by *Lainez* and *Salmeron*, two learned men who were among his first associates. See Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus, tom. i., p. 115, &c.

(17) [The general of the order held his office for life, under certain limitations; was to reside constantly at Rome; and had a select council to advise him, and to execute his orders. His authority over the whole order, and over every person, business, and thing, connected with it, was absolute; nor was he accountable to any earthly superior, except the pope. Over each province was a provincial, whose power was equally despotic over his portion of the society. He visited and inspected all the houses of his province, required regular monthly returns to be made to him from every section of the province of all that was transacted, learned, or contemplated; and then made returns, every three months to the general. Every person belonging to the order was continually inspected, and trained to implicit obedience, secrecy, and fidelity to the order. The whole society was like a regular army, completely officered, trained to service, and governed by the will of one man, who stood at the pope's right hand. See the constitution of the society, as published by *Hospinian*, Historia Jesuitica, lib. i., cap. 4, &c. The secret instructions to the provincials, and to subordinate organs and members of the society, were totally unknown, for the most part, to any persons except those to whom they were addressed. The general rules and artifices, by which individuals were to insinuate themselves every

§ 12. The Romish church since the time it lost dominion over so many nations, owes more to this single society, than to all its other ministers and resources. This being spread in a short time over the greater part of the world, every where confirmed the wavering nations, and restrained the progress of sectarians: it gathered into the Romish church a great multitude of worshippers among the barbarous and most distant nations: it boldly took the field against the heretics, and sustained for a long time almost alone the brunt of the war, and by its dexterity and acuteness in reasoning, entirely eclipsed the glory of the old disputants: by personal address, by skill in the sagacious management of worldly business, by the knowledge of various arts and sciences, and by other means, it conciliated the goodwill of kings and princes: by an ingenious accommodation of the principles of morals to the propensities of men, it obtained almost the sole direction of the minds of kings and magistrates, to the exclusion of the Dominicans and other more rigid divines :(18) and every where, it most studiously guarded the authority of the Romish prelate from sustaining farther loss. All these things procured for the society immense resources and wealth, and the highest reputation; but at the same time, they excited vast envy, very numerous enemies, and frequently exposed the society to the most imminent perils. All the religious orders, the leading men, the public schools, and the magistrates, united to bear down the Jesuits; and they demonstrated by innumerable books, that nothing could be more ruinous both to religion and to the state, than such a society as this. In some countries, as France, Poland, and others, they were pronounced to be public enemies of the country, traitors, and parricides, and were banished with ignominy.(19) Yet the prudence, or if you choose, the cunning of the association, quieted all these movements, and even turned them dexterously to the enlargement of their power, and to the fortification of it against all future machinations.(20)

where, and obtain for the society dominion and control over all persons and transactions, were also among the mysteries of the society. Two copies of them however, the one larger and more minute than the other, entitled Privata Monita Societatis Jesu, and Secreta Monita, &c., were said to have been obtained, the first from a ship bound to the East Indies, and captured by the Dutch, and the other found in the Jesuits' college at Paderborn. But the Jesuits have always and constantly denied their genuineness; nor have the world the means of substantiating their authenticity, except by their coincidence with the visible conduct of the Jesuits. According to these writings, which have been repeatedly published during the two last centuries, nothing could be more crafty and void of all fixed moral principle, than the general policy of the Jesuits. See *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. iii., p. 647, &c.—*Tr.*]

(18) Before the Jesuits arose, the Dominicans alone had the control of the consciences of the European kings and princes. But they were superseded in all the courts, by the Jesuits. See *Wilh. du Peyrat*, Antiquités de la Chapelle de France, lib. i., p. 322, &c.

(19) Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus, tome iii., p. 48, &c. *Boulay's* Historia Acad. Paris., tom. vi., p. 559–648, and in many other places; and a great number of writers, especially those among the Jansenists.—[The Jesuits were expelled from France A.D. 1594; but permitted to return again, at the commencement of the next century. They were expelled from Venice in 1606, from Poland in 1607, and from Bohemia in 1618; to the last-named place however, they were allowed to return two years after.—*Tr.*]

(20) [It was under *Lainez*, the general of the order next after *Loyola*, that the spirit of intrigue entered freely into the society. *Lainez* possessed a peculiar craftiness and dexterity in managing affairs, and was frequently led by it into low and unworthy tricks. His ruling passion was ambition; which however he knew how to conceal from the inexperienced most artfully, under a veil of humility and piety. Under him the society assumed a graver and more manly character, than under his enthusiastic and often ludi-

§ 13. The pontiffs who governed the Latin or Romish church in this century, after *Alexander* VI. [1492–1503], *Pius* III. [1503], *Julius* II. [1503], *Leo* X. [1503–1521], and *Adrian* VI. [1521–1523], who have been already mentioned, were *Clement* VII. [1523–1534], of the Medicean family;(21) *Paul* III. [1534–1549], of the illustrious family of Farnese;(22) *Julius* III. [1550–1555], who was previously called *John Maria de Monte*;(23) *Marcellus* II. [1555], whose name, before his pontificate, was *Marcellus Cervinus*;(24) *Paul* IV. [1555–1559], whose name was *John Peter Caraffa*;(25) *Pius* IV. [1560–1566], who claimed to be a descendant of the Medicean family, and bore the name of *John Angelus de Medicis*;(26) *Pius* V. [1566–1572], a Dominican monk, whose name was *Michael Ghislerus*, a man of a sour temper and excessive austerity, who is

crous predecessor; and its constitution was a master-piece of artful policy, rendering it a terrible army, that dared to undermine states, to rend the church, and even to menace the pope. See the Versuch einer neuen Gesch. des Jesuiterordens, vol. ii.—*Schl.*]

(21) [*Clement* VII. was a bastard; but *Leo* X. removed this stain, by an act of legitimation. His political sagacity was such as would better have adorned the character of a minister of state, than a minister of Christ. Civil history informs us, on what principles he acted with the emperor *Charles* V. See, concerning him, *Jac. Ziegler's* Historia Clementis VII., in *Schelhorn's* Amœnitat. Historiæ eccles. et litter., vol. i., p. 210, &c., and *Sarpi's* Histoire du Concile de Trente, tome i., p. 61, &c.—*Schl.*]

(22) Respecting *Paul* III. there has in our age been much learned discussion, between cardinal *Quirini*, and several distinguished men, as *Kiesling*, *Schelhorn*, and others; the former maintaining that he was a good and eminent man, and the latter, that he was a crafty and perfidious character. See *Quirinus* de Gestis Pauli III. Farnesii. Brixiæ, 1745, 4to. [And *Schelhorn's* Epistola de consilio de emendanda ecclesia, Zurich, 1748, 4to. *Quirini*, ad catholicum aequumque lectorem animadversiones in epistolam Schelhornii, Bresciæ, 1747. *Schelhorn's* second Epistle, 1748, 4to. *Kiesling's* Epistola de Gestis Pauli III., Lips., 1747. Concerning this pope in general, and respecting his views in regard to a general council, see *Sarpi's* Histoire du Concile de Trente, tome i., p. 131, &c. Thus much is clear, from the discussions of these learned men, that Paul III. was an adept in the art of dissimulation, and therefore better fitted to be a statesman, than the head of the church. His whole conduct in regard to the council forced upon him by the cardinals, proves this. That in his youth he was a great debauchee, appears from his two grandsons, *Farnese* and *Sforza*, whom he created cardinals, and of whom the father of the first and the mother of the last, were his illegitimate children.—*Schl.*]

(23) ["This was the worthy pontiff, who was scarcely seated in the papal chair, when he bestowed the cardinal's hat on the keeper of his monkeys, a boy chosen from among the lowest of the populace, and who was also the infamous object of his unnatural pleasures. See *Thuanus*, lib. vi. and xv.—*Hottinger*, Hist. Eccles., tom. v., p. 572, &c., and more especially *Sleidan*, Historia, lib. xxi., folio, m. 609.—When *Julius* was reproached by the cardinals for introducing such an unworthy member into the sacred college, a person who had neither learning, nor virtue, nor merit of any kind, he impudently replied by asking them, What merit or virtue they had found in him, that could induce them to place him (*Julius*) in the papal chair?"—*Macl.*]

(24) [He reigned only twenty-two days. See *Sarpi*, l. c., tome ii., p. 139.—*Schl.*]

(25) ["Nothing could exceed the arrogance and ambition of this violent and impetuous pontiff, as appears from his treatment of queen *Elizabeth*. See *Burnet's* History of the Reformation.—It was he who, by a bull, pretended to raise Ireland to the privilege and quality of an independent kingdom; and it was he also who first instituted the *Index of prohibited books*, mentioned above, § 9."—*Macl.*]

"(26) [His family was very remotely, if at all, descended from the Medicean family of Florence. His character seemed to be totally changed, by his elevation to the papal dignity. The affable, obliging, disinterested, and abstemious cardinal, became an unsocial, selfish, and voluptuous pope. So long as the council of Trent continued, which he controlled more by craft and cunning than by direct authority, he was very reserved; but after its termination, he showed himself without disguise in his true character. This also may deserve notice, that this pope, in the year 1564, allowed the communion in both kinds, in the diocese of Mayence; which allowance

now accounted by the Romanists a saint;(27) *Gregory* XIII. [1572–1585], previously cardinal *Hugo Buoncompagno*;(28) *Sixtus* V. [1585–1590], a Franciscan, called *Montaltus* before his advancement to the papal throne, who excelled all the rest in vigour of mind, pride, magnificence, and other virtues and vices; *Urban* VIII. [1590], *Gregory* XIV. [1590–1591], *Innocent* IX. [1591]; (these three reigned too short a time to distinguish themselves); [*Clement* VIII., 1592–1605]. Some of these were more, and others less meritorious;(29) yet if compared with most of those that ruled the church before the reformation by *Luther*, they were all wise and good men. For since the rise of so many opposers of the Romish power, both within and without, the cardinals have deemed it necessary to be exceedingly cautious, and not commit the arduous government of the church to a person openly vicious, or to a rash and indiscreet young man. And since that period the pontiffs do not, and cannot, assume such despotic power of

also the Austrians and Bavarians had obtained of the pope. (*Gudenus*, Codex Diplom. Moguntt., tom. iv., p. 709). See *Sarpi*, l. c., tome ii., p. 183, &c.—*Schl.*]

(27) [*Pius* V. was of low birth, but had risen as a Dominican, to the office of general commissary to the Inquisition at Rome. And as pope, he practised on the cruel principles which he had learned in that school of cruelty. For he caused many eminent men of learning, and among others the noted *Palearius*, to be burned at the stake; and he showed so little moderation and prudence in his persecuting zeal, that he not only approved of all kinds of violence, and let loose his warriors on France, but also employed the baser methods for the destruction of heretics, insurrections, and treason. Yet this method of proceeding had the contrary effect from what was intended, in France, in England, in Scotland, and in the Netherlands. That he also laboured to prostrate entirely the civil power before the spiritual, and by unreasonably exempting the clergy from all civil taxation greatly injured Spain, France, and Venice, may be learned from civil history. By his command, the Tridentine Catechism was composed and published. *Clement* X. gave him beatification, and *Clement* XI. canonization; which has occasioned many partial biographies to be composed of this pope.—*Schl.*]

(28) See *Jo. Pet. Maffei*, Annales Gregorii XIII., Rome, 1742, 4to. [He was elected by means of the Spanish viceroy of Naples, cardinal de Granville, and was of a milder character than *Pius* V. Yet he openly approved the bloody massacre at Paris on St. Bartholomew's eve, and participated in a treasonable plot against queen *Elizabeth*. His idea of introducing his reformed kalendar as pope, drew on him obloquy from the Protestants; and his attempt to free the clergy from all civil jurisdiction, also from the French. He published the Canon Law improved and enlarged.—*Schl.*]

(29) *Pius* V. and *Sixtus* V. distinguished themselves above the rest; the former, by his extreme severity against heretics, and by publishing the celebrated bull called *In Cœna Domini*, which is [was, till the reign of *Clement* XIV.] annually read at Rome, on the festival of the Holy Sacrament; and the latter, by his many vigorous, splendid, and resolute acts for advancing the glory and honour of the church. The life of *Pius* V. has been written by many persons in our age, since *Clement* XI. enrolled him among the saints. On the bull: *In Cœna Domini*, and the commotions it occasioned, *Giannone* has treated, in his Histoire civile de Naples, lib. xxxiii., cap. iv., tome iv., p. 248, &c., [and still more fully and circumstantially, the author of the Pragmatic History of this bull.—*Schl.*] The life of *Sixtus* V., by *Gregory Leti*, has been often published, and in different languages; but it is in many parts deficient in fidelity. [*Sixtus* V. was a complete statesman, and possessing a high degree of dissimulation he could play any part; and instead of the fruitless attempt of his predecessors to reduce the heretics again to obedience, he endeavoured to increase his power by conquering the kingdom of Naples, by retaining the princes that were still in his interests, and by encroachments upon their power. The Jesuits, for whom he had no partiality, hated him. The splendour of the city of Rome, the papal treasury, and the Vatican library, owe much to him. He likewise promoted the Romish edition of the Septuagint in 1587, and the edition of the Latin Vulgate, Rome, 1590, in 3 vols. fol. While a cardinal in 1580, he published at Rome the collected works of *Ambrose*, in 5 vols. See *Dr. Walch's* History of the Popes, p. 399.—*Schl.*]

deciding on the greatest matters according to their own mere pleasure, as their predecessors did; but they must pronounce sentence ordinarily according to the decision of their senate, that is of the *cardinals*, and of the congregations to which certain parts of the government are intrusted. Moreover neither prudence, nor the silently increasing power of emperors and kings, and the continual decrease of ignorance and superstition, will permit them to excite wars among nations, to issue bulls of excommunication and deposition against kings, and to arm the citizens, as they formerly did, against their lawful sovereigns. In short, stern necessity has been the mother of prudence and moderation, at Rome, as often elsewhere.

§ 14. The condition of the clergy subject to the Roman pontiff, remained unchanged. Some of the bishops at times, and especially at the council of Trent, very earnestly sought to recover their ancient rights, of which the pontiffs had deprived them; and they supposed that the pontiff might be compelled to acknowledge, that bishops were of divine origin, and derived their authority from Christ himself.(30) But all these attempts were frustrated, by the vigilance of the Romish court, which did not cease to repeat the odious maxim, that bishops are only the ministers and legates of the vicar of Jesus Christ resident at Rome, and that they are indebted for all the power and authority they possess to the generosity and *grace of the apostolic see*. Yet there were some, particularly among the French, who little regarded that principle. And what the Romish jurists call *reservations*, *provisions*, *exemptions*, and *expectatives*, which had drawn forth complaints from all the nations before the reformation, and which were the most manifest proofs of the Romish tyranny, now almost entirely ceased.

§ 15. Respecting the lives and morals of the clergy and the reformation of inveterate evils, there was deliberation in the council of Trent: and on this subject some decrees were passed, which cannot be disapproved. But good men complain, that those decrees have to this day found no executor, and that they are neglected with impunity by all, and especially by those of more elevated rank and station. The German bishops, as every one knows, have almost nothing except their dress, their titles, and certain ceremonies, from which the nature of their office could be inferred. In the other countries very many of the prelates, with the tacit consent of the pope, are more devoted to courts, to voluptuousness, to wealth and ambition, than to Jesus Christ, to whom they profess to be consecrated: and only a very small number care for the interests of the Christian community, or of piety and religion. Moreover, those who are most attentive to these things, can scarcely escape invidious remarks, criminations, and vexations of various kinds. Many perhaps would be better and more devout, were they not corrupted by the example of Rome, or did they not see the very heads of the church and their servants, wholly devoted to luxury, avarice, pride, revenge, voluptuousness, and vain pomp. The *canons* as they are called, almost everywhere continue to adhere to their pristine mode of life, and consume often, not very piously or honestly, the wealth which the piety of former ages had consecrated to the poor. The rest of the clergy however, cannot at their pleasure everywhere copy after these preposterous moral guides. For it must be admitted, that since the reformation by *Luther*, much more pains is taken than formerly, to prevent the lower orders of the clergy from disregarding the rules of sobriety and ex-

(30) Here may be consulted, *Paul Sarpi's* Historia Concilii Tridentini.

ternal decency, lest their open profligacy should give offence to the people.

§ 16. Nearly the same praise belongs to the monks. In most of the governors of monasteries, there are things which deserve the severest reprehension; nor are idleness, gluttony, ignorance, knavery, quarrels, lasciviousness, and the other once prevalent vices of the monasteries, entirely expelled and banished from them. Yet it would be uncandid to deny, that in many countries the morals of the monks are subjected to stricter rules; and that the remaining vestiges of the ancient profligacy, are at least more carefully concealed. There have also arisen some, who have laboured to restore the almost extinct austerity of the ancient rules; and others who have attempted to establish new fraternities for the public benefit of the church. *Matthew de Baschi*, an Italian, an honest but simple man, of that society of Franciscans who supposed they obeyed the precepts of their founder more religiously than the others, and who are commonly called *Observant Friars* (Fratres de Observantia), thought himself called of God to restore the institutes of *St. Francis* to their original and genuine integrity. His design being approved by *Clement* VII. in the year 1525, gave rise to the fraternity of *Capuchins;* which experienced the bitter indignation of the other Franciscans, and exhibited a great appearance of gravity, modesty, and disregard for worldly things.(31) The fraternity derived its name from the *cowl*, (caputium), a covering for the head sewed to the Franciscan coat, which *St. Francis* himself is said to have worn.(32) Another progeny of the Franciscan order, were those called *Recollets* in France, *Reformati* in Italy, and *Barefooted* (Discalceati) in Spain; and who likewise obtained the privileges of a separate association distinct from the others, in the year 1532, by authority of *Clement* VII. They differ from the other Franciscans, by endeavouring to live more exactly according to the rules of their common lawgiver.(33) *St. Theresia*, a Spanish lady of noble birth, aided in the arduous work by *P. John de Matthia*, who was afterwards called *John de St. Cruce*, endeavoured to restore the too luxurious and almost dissolute lives of the Carmelites to their pristine gravity. Nor were these efforts without effect; notwithstanding the greatest part of the Carmelites made opposition. Hence the order was divided during ten years, into two parties, the one observing severer and the other laxer rules. But as this difference as to their mode of life among members of the same family, occasioned much animosity and discord, *Gregory* XIII. in the year 1580, at the request of *Philip* II. king of Spain, directed the more rigid Carmelites who were called *Barefooted* (Discalceati) from their

(31) See *Luc. Wadding's* Annales Ordinis Minorum, tom. xvi., p. 207, 257, &c., ed. Rome. *Hipp. Helyot's* Histoire des Ordres Monastiques, tome vii., cap. xxiv., p. 264. And especially, *Zach. Boverius*, Annales Capucinorum. [The founder of the order of Capuchins, is not well known. Some give this honour to *Matthew Baschi*, and others to the famous *Lewis de Fossembrun*. *Bover* supposes, that *Baschi* devised the cowl, but that *Fossembrun* was the author of the reform; and he thence infers, that his order was not the work of men, but like *Melchizedek*, without father and without mother. The order had the misfortune, that its first vicar-general *Bernhard Ochin*, and afterwards the third also, turned Protestants; which wellnigh worked its ruin. Yet it afterwards spread itself over Italy, France, Spain, and Germany, with extraordinary success.—*Schl.*]

(32) See *Du Fresne's* Glossarium Latinitat. medii ævi, tom. ii., p. 298, ed. Bened., [art. Caputium.]

(33) *Luc. Wadding's* Annales, tom. xvi., p. 167. *Helyot's* Histoire des Ordres, tome vii., cap. xviii., &c., p. 129, &c.

going with naked feet, to separate themselves from the more lax. *Sixtus* V. confirmed and extended this separation, in 1587; and *Clement* VIII. completed it in 1593, by giving to the new association an appropriate chief or general. A few years after when new contests arose between these brethren, the same pontiff in the year 1600, again separated them into two societies, governed by their respective generals.(34)

§ 17. Of the new orders that arose in this century, the most distinguished was that which proudly assumed the name of *Jesus;* and which has been already noticed among the props of the Romish power. Compared with this, the others appeared ignoble and obscure.—The reformation afforded occasion for various societies of what are called *Regular Clerks.* As all these professed to aim at imitating and restoring the ancient virtue and sanctity of the clerical order, they tacitly bear witness to the laxity of discipline among the clergy, and the necessity of a reformation. The first that arose were the *Theatins,* so named from the town *Theate* or *Chieti* [in the kingdom of Naples], whose bishop at that time was *John Peter Caraffa,* afterwards pope *Paul* IV., who, with the aid of *Cajetan de Thienœis* and some others, founded this society in the year 1524. Destitute of all possessions and all revenue, they were to live upon the voluntary bounties of the pious; and were required to succour decaying piety, to improve the style of preaching, to attend upon the sick and dying, and to oppose manfully and vigorously all heretics.(35) There were also some convents of sacred virgins connected with this order.—Next in point of time to them, were those that assumed the name of *Regular Clerks of St. Paul* whom they chose for their patron, but who were commonly called *Barnabites,* from the temple of *St. Barnabas* at Milan which was given to them in the year 1535. This fraternity was approved by *Clement* VII. in 1532; and confirmed by *Paul* III. in 1535. It honoured as its founders *Antony Mavia Zacharias* a knight of Cremona, and *Bartholomew Ferrarius* a knight of Milan, also *Jac. Antony Morigia* of Milan. At first they renounced all possessions and property, like the Theatins, living solely upon the gratuitous gifts of the pious; but afterwards they deemed it expedient to hold property and have certain revenues. Their principal business was, to labour as preachers in reclaiming sinners to their duty.(36) The *Regular Clerks of St. Majoli,* also called *the Fathers of Somasquo,* from the town *Somasquo* where their first general resided, had for their founder *Jerome Æmilianus,* and were approved by *Paul* III. in the year 1540, and then by *Pius* IV. in 1543.(37) These assumed the office of carefully instructing the ignorant and especially the young, in the precepts of Christianity. —The same office was assigned to *the Fathers of the Christian doctrine,* both in France and in Italy. A distinguished society of this name, was collected in France by *Cæsar de Bus;* and it was enrolled among the legitimate fraternities by *Clement* VIII. in the year 1597. The Italian society owed its birth to *Marcus Cusanus* a knight of Milan, and was approved by the authority of *Pius* V. and *Gregory* XIII.

(34) *Helyot,* Histoire des Ordres, tome i., cap. xlvii., p. 340, &c.

(35) *Helyot,* Histoire des Ordres, tome iv., cap. xii., p. 71, &c.

(36) *Helyot,* l. c., tome iv., c. xv., p. 100. In this part of his noted and excellent work, *Helyot* with great industry and accuracy, prosecutes the history of the other sects which we have here mentioned.

(37) See the Acta Sanctor., Februar., tom. ii., p. 217, &c.

§ 18. It would occupy us too long and would not be very profitable, to enumerate the minor fraternities which originated from the perturbation excited in the Romish church by the heretics of Germany and other countries. For no age produced more associations of this kind, than that in which *Luther* held up the Bible, against ignorance, superstition, and papal domination. Some of them have since become extinct, because they had no solid basis; and others have been suppressed by the will of the pontiffs, who considered the interests of the church as retarded rather than advanced by the multitude of such societies. We also omit the societies of nuns; among whom the *Ursulines* were distinguished for their numbers and reputation.(38) But we must not pass over the *Fathers of the Oratory*, founded in Italy by *Philip Nerius*, and publicly approved by *Gregory* XIII. in 1577; because they have had not a few men distinguished for their erudition and talents, (among whom were *Cæsar Baronius*, and afterwards *Odoric Raynald*, and in our age *James Laderchius*, the celebrated authors of the Annals of the Church), and because they have not yet ceased to flourish. The name of the sect is derived from the chapel or *oratory*, which *Nerius* built for himself at Florence and occupied for many years.(39)

§ 19. That both sacred and secular learning were held in much higher estimation among the Romish Christians after the time of *Luther*, than before, is known very generally. In particular, the Jesuits glory, and not altogether without reason, that the languages and the arts and sciences

(38) [The foundress of this order was *Angela de Brescia*, an Italian lady of Lombardy, who belonged to the third order of St. Francis. In the year 1537, she thought herself guided by a revelation to form a new order of nuns, for relieving the sufferings of mankind, and with a special view to confute the vulgar charge against nunneries, that they are mere houses of impurity. The name of *Ursulines* she borrowed from *St. Ursula*, a legendary British saint of the fourth or fifth century, who with her companions suffered death at Cologne, rather than allow their chastity to be violated. (See *Adr. Baillet*, Vies des Saints, tom. iii., Octob. 21, p. 330, &c.) At first she proposed that her nuns should not be cloistered, but should reside in the private families to which they belonged, so that their devout and virtuous lives might be open to the inspection of all. But she afterwards allowed them to live in communities or nunneries. Their monastic rule was that of St. Augustine. They were to search out the afflicted and unfortunate, to administer to them instruction and consolation, to relieve the poor, to visit hospitals, and to wait on the sick, and every where afford their personal services to such as needed them. The foundress died in 1540. Cardinal *Borromeo* archbp. of Milan, was a great patron of this order, which was first legalized by *Paul* III. in 1544, and afterwards by *Gregory* XIII. in 1571. It flourished much in the north of Italy, and was introduced into France in 1611, where it acquired a high reputation, and could soon number more than 300 cloisters distributed into several congregations. The kind offices of these sisters to all who needed their services, and their attention to the education of females, caused them to be held in high estimation. From France the order was extended to Canada, and also to the United States, in both which it still exists and is in reputation. See *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. s. d. Reform., vol. iii., p. 503, &c., who refers us to *Helyot*, Hist. des Ordres, tome iv., p. 150–223, and to the Gesch. der vornehmsten Mönchsorden, b. vi., s. 203, &c.—*Tr.*]

(39) *Helyot*, Histoire des Ordres, tome viii., cap. iv., p. 12. [*Raynald's* Annales Eccles., ad ann. 1564, § 5. The exercises in the Oratory were these. When the associates were collected, a short time was spent in prayer, ordinarily silent prayer. Then *Nerius* addressed the company. Next a portion of some religious book was read, on which *Nerius* made remarks. After an hour occupied in these exercises, three of the associates successively mounted a little rostrum, and gave each a discourse about half an hour long on some point in theology, or on church history, or practical religion; and the meeting closed for the day. See *Baronius*, Annales Eccles., tom. i., p. 555. *Baronius* was himself an early pupil of *Nerius*, and succeeded him as head of the order.—*Tr.*]

were more cultivated and advanced by their society, during this century, than by the schools and by the other religious fraternities. The schools and universities, (whether designedly or from negligence, I will not say), were not disposed to abandon the old method of teaching, though rude and tedious, nor to enlarge the field of their knowledge. Nor would the monks allow a more solid and elegant culture to be given to their minds. Hence there is a great diversity in the Romish writers of this century; some express themselves happily, methodically, and properly; others barbarously, immethodically, and coarsely. Ecclesiastical history was a subject which *Cæsar Baronius* undertook to elucidate, or to obscure: and his example prompted many others to attempt the same thing. This labour was rendered necessary by the temerity of the heretics; for they with *Matthias Flacius* and *Martin Chemnitz* at their head,(40) having demonstrated that not only the sacred scriptures but also the voice of ancient history were opposed to the doctrines and decrees of the Romish church, prompt resistance became necessary, lest the ancient fables on which a great part of the claims of the pontiffs rested, should lose all their credit.

§ 20. The improvement of philosophy was attempted, by several men of fine talents both among the French and Italians, whose names have already been given. But their efforts were rendered ineffectual, by the excessive attachment of the scholastic doctors to the old Aristotelian philosophy, and by the cautious timidity of many who were apprehensive that such freedom of thought and discussion might subvert the tottering interests of the church, and open the way for other and new dissensions. The empire of *Aristotle* therefore, whose very obscurity rendered him the more acceptable, continued unshaken in all the schools and monasteries. It even became more firmly established, after the Jesuits saw fit to subject their schools to it, and showed by their discussions and their books, that the

(40) The former in the *Centuriæ Magdeburgicæ*, and the latter in his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*.—[*Matthias Flacius*, after his removal from Wittenberg to Madgeburg, with the aid of the two Madgeburg preachers, *John Wigand* and *Matthew Judex*, the jurist *Basil Faber*, and *Andrew Corvinus*, *Thomas Holthuters*, and others, published the Madgeburg Centuries between the years 1559 and 1574, in thirteen volumes folio, each volume containing one century. Its proper title is, Historiæ ecclesiasticæ per aliquot studiosos et pios viros in urbe Magdeburgica Centuriæ xiii. A new edition was commenced in 1757, at Nuremberg; [but was carried only to the sixth volume, in 4to. An edition with some abridgment, was published by *Lucius*, Basil, 1624, 13 vols. in 3, large folio. This edition is most current among the Reformed, though disapproved by the Lutherans.—*Tr.*] *Cæsar Baronius*, a father of the oratory, [at the instigation of *Philip Nerius*, founder of the society of the oratory], undertook to confute this work which contained strong historical proofs against popery, in a work of twelve volumes folio, each volume likewise embracing one century. His work is entitled Annales ecclesiastici, and was published at Rome, between the years 1588 and 1607; and afterwards at Mentz, with the approbation of the author. The latest, most splendid, and most complete edition, was published with *Antony Pagi* a French Franciscan's corrections, (entitled, Critica Historico-chronologica in Annales Baronii, 4 vols. fol.), and the continuation of *Odoric Raynald*, (in 10 vols. fol.) at Lucca, 1738–1756, in 38 vols. fol. These ecclesiastical annals are by no means impartial; yet they contain numerous documents, which cast light on both ecclesiastica. and civil history. *Raynald's* continuation reaches to the year 1565. *James de Laderchi*, likewise a father of the oratory, extended the Annals to the year 1572. The apostate Reformed, *Henry de Sponde* or *Spondanus*, bishop of Pamiers, likewise composed a continuation of *Baronius* to the year 1640, in three volumes fol. So also the Polish Dominican, *Abraham Bzovius*, continued Baronius to the year 1572, in eight vols. folio; but he is the most faulty of all that have been named, both in respect to the matter and the spirit of his performance.—*Schl.*]

Aristotelian scholastic subtilties, equivocations, and intricacies were better suited to confound the heretics and to carry on controversy with some appearance of success, than the simple and lucid mode of arguing and debating, which sound reason left to herself would dictate.

§ 21. Of the theological writers in the Romish church during this century, a very large catalogue might be made out. The most famous and most competent among them, were, *Thomas de Vio Cajetan*, *John Eck*, *John Cochlæus*, *Jerome Emser*, *Laurence Surius*, *Stanislaus Hosius*, *John Faber*, *James Sadolet*, *Albert Pighi*, *Francis Vatablus*, *Melchior Canus*, *Claudius Espencæus*, *Bartholomew Caranza*, *John Maldonate*, *Francis Turrianus*, *Benedict Arias Montanus*, *Ambrose Catharinus*, *Reginald Pole*, *Sixtus Senensis*, *George Cassander*, *James Paya Andradius*, *Michael Baius*, *James Pamelius*, and others.(41)

(41) Concerning these, and others designedly omitted, the reader may consult *Louis Ellies du Pin*, a doctor of the Sorbonne, in his Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiast., tome xiv. and xvi., and the other writers of biography. [The following brief notices of the writers mentioned by Mosheim, may not be unacceptable.

Of *Cajetan*, see above, p. 23, notes (21), (22).

John Eckius or *John Mayer*, was born at *Eck*, a village in Swabia, A.D. 1483; was professor of theology at Ingolstadt, vice-chancellor, inquisitor, and canon of Eichstadt; and died 1543. He disputed and wrote much against *Luther* and the Protestants.

The real name of *Cochlæus* was *John Dobeneck*, surnamed *Cochlæus* from the Latinized name of his birthplace, *Wendelstein* in Nuremberg. He was a dean at Frankfort, and a canon at Mentz and Breslau, and died in 1552; a most rancorous and uncandid opposer of the reformation.

Emser was of Ulm in Swabia, and died in 1527. He was a licentiate of canon law, criticized *Luther's* version of the New Testament, and undertook to make a better.

Surius was a laborious Carthusian monk of Lubec, and died at Cologne in 1578. Besides his translations, he published four volumes of the Councils, and seven volumes of lives of the saints; and wrote a concise general history, from A.D. 1500 to 1574, in opposition to *Sleidan's* Commentaries.

Hosius was of Cracow, and at his death in 1579, was bishop of Ermeland, cardinal, and grand penitentiary to pope Gregory XIII. He acted a conspicuous part in the council of Trent, was a manly opposer of the reformation, and left works in 2 vols. fol.

Faber was a Swabian, named *Heigerlin*, but was called *Faber* from his father's occupation. He was a Dominican, and opposed the sale of indulgences in Switzerland; yet aided the pope against the Protestants, and became bishop of Vienna. None of his writings are now read.

Sadolet was a mild, liberal divine, secretary to *Leo* X., bishop of Carpentras, and a cardinal. His works were printed at Verona, 1737, 4 vols. fol.

Pighi was a Dutchman, archdeacon at Utrecht, a mathematician, and a man of more reading than judgment; and died in 1542.

Vatablus of Picardy, was a learned professor of Hebrew at Paris, in the reign of *Francis* I.

Canus, a Spanish Dominican, professor of theology at Salamanca, bishop of the Canary Islands, provincial of his order in Castile, and died in 1560. His chief work was his Locorum communium libri xii.

Espencæus was a famous Parisian divine of great erudition, who died in 1571.

Caranza was a Dominican, confessor to *Philip* II. of Spain, to queen *Mary* of England, and to *Charles* V.; also archbishop of Toledo; yet he was charged with heresy, and suffered ten years in the Inquisition; and died almost as soon as released, A.D. 1576. He wrote Summa Conciliorum et Decret. Pontificum.

Maldonate was a Spanish Jesuit, a distinguished theologian, and Scriptural expositor; born 1534, died 1582.

Turrianus was also a Spanish Jesuit, but of less talents. He died in 1584.

Montanus was a Spanish Orientalist, and editor of the Antwerp Polyglot Bible. He also wrote commentaries on the Scriptures; and died in 1598.

Catharinus of Sienna in Italy, was first a jurist, then a Dominican, bishop of Minorca, and lastly archbishop of Conza in the kingdom of Naples. He wrote against the Protestants, commented on Paul's epistles, and died in 1553.

Cardinal *Pole* was of royal English blood, opposed king *Henry* VIII. in the matter of his divorce, and left England; but returned.

§ 22. The religion which Rome would have men regard as the only true religion, and which she enjoins on all Christians universally, is derived as all their writers tell us, from two sources, *the written word of God*, and *the unwritten*, or the *holy scriptures* and *tradition*. But as there are warm contests among the leading divines of that church, respecting the legitimate interpreter of this twofold word of God, it may be justly said, that it is not yet clear whence a knowledge of the Romish doctrines is to be learned, or by what authority controversies on sacred subjects are to be decided. The Romish court indeed, and all that favour the absolute dominion of the pontiff, maintain that no one can interpret and explain the import of either divine word in matters relating to salvation, except the person who governs the church as Christ's vicegerent; and of course, that his decisions must be religiously obeyed. To give weight to this opinion, first *Pius* IV. and afterwards *Sixtus* V. established at Rome the congregation styled the *Congregation for interpreting the council of Trent* (de interpretando Tridentino concilio); which decides in the name of the pontiff, the smaller questions respecting points of discipline; but the weightier questions touching any point of doctrine, it refers to the pontiff himself as the oracle.(42) But a very different opinion is entertained both by the greatest part of the French and by other men of great learning, who maintain, that individual doctors and bishops may go directly to both sources, and from them obtain for themselves and for the people rules of faith and practice; and that the greater and more difficult questions of controversy, are to be submit-

as papal legate, on the accession of queen *Mary*, was made archbishop of Canterbury, and died on the very day his sovereign did, A.D. 1558. He was learned, discreet, and inclined to moderation. His letters were published by cardinal *Quirini*, at Brescia, in 1744.

Sixtus of Sienna was born a Jew, became a Franciscan, was accused of heresy, joined the Dominicans, and died in 1569. His Bibliotheca Sancta, or Introduction to Biblical literature, is the chief foundation of his reputation.

Cassander was born on the island of *Cassand*, near Bruges, and was a modest, ingenuous divine, who studied to bring the Catholics and Protestants to a better agreement, and incurred the ill will of both. He died in 1566; and his works were printed at Paris, in 1616, fol.

Andradius was a Portuguese theologian, who attended the council of Trent, and attempted to vindicate its proceedings against *Chemnitz's* attack.

Baius was doctor and professor of theology at Louvain, chancellor of the university, general inquisitor for the Netherlands, and a strong adherent to the doctrines of Augustine; which brought him into difficulty, as we shall see presently, § 38. He died in 1589.

Pamelius was a modest and honest theologian of the Netherlands, whose father *Adolphus*, baron of Pamele, was counsellor of state to *Charles* V. He died on his way to take possession of his new office of bishop of St. Omers, A.D. 1587. He edited the works of *Tertullian* and of *Cyprian*.—*Tr.*]

(42) *Jac. Aymon*, Tableau de la cour de Rome, part v., cap. iv., p. 282, &c. [This congregation affords the pope a fine opportunity to obtrude his court decisions on the Catholic world, under the pretence of the council of Trent. It is the duty of the cardinals to explain the language of the council, only in doubtful cases; but they often extend the import of the words so far, that the pope finds the way open to introduce new laws into the church. See *Febronius*, de Statu ecclesiæ, cap. v., § 3, no. 7.—*Schl.* The canonists long debated, whether the decisions of this congregation formed a part of the ecclesiastical law of the Catholic church. Those who maintained that they were not law, urged unanswerably, that those decisions were not published; and that rules of conduct not made known, could never be considered as laws by which men were to be judged. To remove this objection, in the year 1739 formal reports of the decisions of the congregation began to be published, reaching back to the year 1718; and the publication of these reports was continued to the year 1769, when thirty-eight volumes 4to had been issued, embracing all the decisions of importance from the year 1718 to the year 1769, inclusive.—*Tr.*]

ted to the examination and decision of councils. There is no judge that can terminate this controversy; and hence there is no prospect that the Romish religion will ever obtain a stable and determinate form.

§ 23. The council of Trent, which is said to have been summoned to explain, arrange, and reform both the doctrine and the discipline of the church, is thought by wise men to have rather produced new enormities, than to have removed those that existed. They complain that many opinions of the scholastic doctors, concerning which in former times men thought and spoke as they pleased, were improperly sanctioned and placed among the doctrines necessary to be believed, and even guarded by anathemas:(43) they complain of the ambiguity of the decrees and decisions of the council, in consequence of which, controverted points are not so much explained and settled as perplexed and made more difficult;(44) they complain that every thing was decided in the council, not according to truth and the holy scriptures, but according to the prescriptions of the Roman pontiff, and that the Romish legates took from the fathers of the council almost all liberty of correcting existing evils in the church;(45) they complain that the few decisions which were wise and correct, were left naked and unsupported, and are neglected and disregarded with impunity; in short, they think the council of Trent was more careful to subserve the interests of the papal dominion, than the general interests of the

(43) [Here belong, for example, *Peter Lombard's* doctrine of *seven* sacraments, the necessity of auricular confession, the canonical authority of the apocryphal books, &c.; and by the anathema pronounced against the opposite doctrines, the reintroduction of these supposed heresies into the church, and all attempts at a religious union in future, are rendered impossible.—*Schl.*]

(44) [The reader need only consult the second article, concerning justification and free-will. The council here frequently expresses itself according to the views of *Luther;* but presently, it takes back with one hand what it had given with the other. This arose from the disputes of the fathers in the council among themselves. The only way to quiet their contentions, was to publish articles of faith so ambiguous that each party could construe them to agree with their own opinions. Hence it is, that to this day the council is so differently interpreted in the Romish church. Hence the Spanish Dominican, *Dominic Soto*, wrote three books to prove that the council was of his opinion, on the subject of grace and justification; while the Franciscan, *Andrew Vega* whose opinions were very different, wrote fifteen to prove directly the contrary. So is it also in regard to the doctrine respecting the penitence necessary to repentance. The Jesuits say, this penitence consists in an internal fear of God and a dread of divine punishments, which they call *attrition*. Their opposers maintain, that this is not sufficient, but that true penitence must arise from love to God, and regret for having sinned against him. This dispute is not decided by the council; for one passage appears to deny, what another asserts. And hence *John Launoi* wrote a book, de mente concilii Tridentini circa contritionem, attritionem, et satisfactionem, in Sacramento pœnitentiæ; and he there shows, that the words of the council may be fairly construed as every one pleases. The doctrines concerning the church, and concerning the power of the pope and its limits, are for good reasons left undecided. So also the contested doctrines concerning the conception and birth of the virgin *Mary*, and the real nature of the worship to be paid to images and to the saints. The doctrine respecting tradition, is likewise made very equivocal and obscure.—*Schl.*]

(45) [No pope indeed was personally present in the council, but they still governed it by their legates. Nothing was permitted to be discussed, without the consent of the legates; and no conclusion was made, which had not been previously prepared and shaped in the particular congregations [or committees], in which the legates always presided. Hence the satirists said, that the Holy Ghost (by whom, according to the court language of the church, such councils are always guided) was brought from Rome in a portmanteau, in order to enlighten the fathers. There were in fact several intelligent and thinking men among the fathers of the council; but they were outvoted by the multitude of Italians and dependants of the pope. —*Schl.*]

Christian church. And hence it is not strange that there should be some among the sons of the Romish church, who choose to expound the decrees of the Tridentine council itself according to the sense of the sacred volume and *tradition*, and that the authority of those decrees should be differently estimated in the different Catholic countries.(46)

§ 24. Recourse must be had to the decrees of the council of Trent, together with the brief confession of faith which *Pius* IV. caused to be drawn up, by all those who would gain a tolerable knowledge of the Romish religion. A full and perfect knowledge of it, is not in this way to be expected. For in the decrees of the council, and in the confession of faith above mentioned, many articles are so nerveless and without joints, that they reel hither and thither; and they were designedly left in this dubious state, on account of the intestine dissensions of the church. Moreover, not a few things were passed by, in both those works, which yet must not be denied nor even called in question without giving offence; and some things are there expressed more decently and better, than daily practice and public usage authorize. Hence reliance must not always be placed on the language used by the council; but rather the import of that lan-

(46) Some provinces of the Romish church, as Germany, Poland, Italy, [and Portugal], have received the council of Trent and its decrees, entire, and without exceptions or conditions. But others, only under certain limitations and conditions, would subject themselves to it. Of these the principal were, the countries subject to the king of Spain, which were long in controversy with the Roman pontiff respecting the council of Trent, and at last embraced it with a salvo of the rights of the Spanish kings (salvis Regum Hispaniæ juribus). See *Giannone*, Histoire civile du Royaume de Naples, [lib. lxxxiii., cap. 3., sec. 1], tome iv., p. 235, &c. Others again could never be induced to adopt it. Among these was France. See *Hector Godfr. Masius*, Diss. de contemptu concilii Tridentini in Gallia; which is one among his collected Dissertations: and Peter *Francis le Courayer's* Discours sur la reception du concile de Trente, particulierment en France, which is subjoined to the second volume of his French translation of Paul Sarpi's History of the council of Trent, p. 775–789. Yet that part of the council which embraces the doctrines of religion, was tacitly and by practice admitted as a rule of faith among the French. But the other part, which relates to discipline and ecclesiastical law, has been constantly rejected both publicly and privately; because it is deemed hostile to the authority and power of kings, no less than to the rights and liberties of the French church. See *Louis Ellies du Pin*, Bibliotheque des Auteurs ecclesiastiques, tom. xv., p. 380, &c. Hungary also is said to have never publicly received this council. See *Lorand Samuel-of*, Vita Andr. Dudithii, p. 56. As for the literary history of the council of Trent, the writers of its history, editions of its decrees, &c., see *Salig's* History of the council of Trent, (in German), vol. iii., p. 190–320., and *Jo. Chr. Köcher's* Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolica, p. 325, 377, &c.—[As to the reception of the council of Trent in Germany, it did not take place at once. The pope *Pius* IV. sent the bishop of Vintimiglia *Visconti*, to the emperor *Ferdinand* I. to persuade him to receive it. But the emperor consented only on two conditions; that the pope should allow his subjects the use of the cup in the sacred supper, and should not debar the clergy from marriage. The same indulgence was craved by the Bavarians. *Pius* allowed the first, but denied the second; and *Ferdinand* acquiesced, and received the council for himself and his hereditary dominions. The whole German nation has never received it; and the popes have never dared to submit its decrees to the consideration of the diet, and to ask their sanction of them. —This probably will have been the last general council of Christendom; for it is not probable that the opposing interests of the great, with good policy, will ever again allow of a general council, since the weakness and intrigues of such bodies have been so clearly exhibited by this. The popes would also show themselves not very favourable to another general council, since the right of summoning such a council to meet, and that of presiding in it, would be contested with them; and as so many appeals would be likely to be made to the proposed general council, from their own decisions.—*Schl.*]

guage must be qualified and measured, by the practices and the institutions that generally prevail.(47) Add to these considerations, that since the time of the council of Trent, some of the pontiffs have explained more clearly and unequivocally in their particular constitutions or bulls, certain doctrines which were stated less clearly by the council: in which thing, no one appears to have acted more audaciously and unsuccessfully, than *Clement* XI. in his famous bull called *Unigenitus*.

§ 25. To the correct interpretation and the knowledge of the holy scriptures, the Roman pontiff opposed all the obstacles in his power, from the time that he learned what very great damage and loss accrued to him from this source. In the first place, disputants are allowed the shocking license of treating the scriptures with contumely, and of publicly declaring their authority to be inferior to that of the pontiff and tradition. Next, the old Latin version called the *Vulgate*, though it abounds with innumerable faults and in very many places is quite barbarous and obscure, was by a decision of the assembly at Trent, recommended as *authentic*, that is, as faithful, exact, and accurate, and therefore not liable to be impugned. How much this contributed to conceal from the people the true meaning of the scriptures, must be manifest. In the same assembly, this hard law was imposed on interpreters, that *in matters of faith and morals* they must not venture to construe the scriptures differently from the common opinion of the church and the consent of the ancient doctors; nay, it was asserted that the *church* alone, or its head and governor the sovereign pontiff, has the right of determining the true sense of the scriptures. Finally, the Romish church has persevered in strenuously maintaining, sometimes more explicitly and sometimes more covertly, that the sacred scriptures were written for none but the teachers; and in all places where it would bear,(48) it has ordered the people to be restrained from reading the Bible.

§ 26. For these reasons, the multitude of expositors, who were excited by the example of *Luther* and his followers to engage eagerly in the work of biblical interpretation, are for the most part dry, timid, and obsequious to the will of the Romish court. Nearly all of them are extremely cautious, lest they should drop a single word at variance with the received opinions; they always quote the authority and the names of the holy *fathers* as they call them, and do not so much inquire what the inspired writers actually taught, as what the church would have them teach. Some of them tax their ingenuity to the utmost, to force out of each passage of scripture that fourfold sense which ignorance and superstition devised, namely the *literal*, *allegorical*, *tropological*, and *anagogical*. And with good reason; for this mode of interpretation is most convenient for artfully eliciting from the divine oracles whatever the church wishes to have regarded as truth.

(47) ["This is true, in a more especial manner, with respect to the canons of the council of Trent relating to the doctrine of *purgatory*, the *invocation of saints*, the *worship of images and relics*. The terms employed in these canons are artfully chosen, so as to avoid the imputation of idolatry, in the *philosophical* sense of that word; for in the *scripture-sense* they cannot avoid it, as all use of images in religious worship is expressly forbidden in the sacred writings in many places. But this circumspection does not appear in the worship of the Roman Catholics, which is notoriously idolatrous in both the senses of that word."—*Macl.*]

(48) This could not be done in all countries. The French, and some other nations, read the Scriptures in their native language; notwithstanding the warm supporters of the Romish supremacy, are bitterly opposed to the practice.

Yet we can name some, who had wisdom enough to discard these vain mysteries, and to labour solely to ascertain the literal import of the scriptures. In this class the most eminent were the following: *Erasmus* of Rotterdam, who is well known to have translated the books of the New Testament into neat and perspicuous Latin, and to have explained them in a pleasing manner; *Thomas de Vio Cajetanus*, the cardinal who disputed with our *Luther* at Augsburg, and whose brief notes on nearly all the sacred books are better than many longer commentaries; *Francis Titelmann, Isidorus Clarius, John Maldonat, Benedict Justinian*, (who was no contemptible interpreter of St. Paul's epistles), *John Gagnæus, Claudius Espencæus*, and some others.(49) But these laudable examples ceased to have influence, sooner than might be expected. For at the close of the century, there was only one in the university of Paris, namely *Edmund Richer* the celebrated defender of the Gallic liberties against the pontiffs, who investigated the literal meaning of the scriptures; all the other doctors despised the literal sense, and in the manner of the ancients searched after recondite and concealed meanings.(50)

§ 27. Before *Luther's* time, nearly all the schools were occupied by the philosophical theologians, or what are called the *Scholastics;* so that even at Paris, which was considered as the seat of all sacred knowledge, persons could not be found competent to encounter our divines in reasoning from the scriptures and the writings of the ancient doctors. And even in the council of Trent, this extreme penury of *dogmatic* and *biblical* theologians often produced singular difficulties, as the Scholastics were accustomed to measure and define all doctrines according to the precepts of their lean and meager philosophy. Pressing necessity therefore, urged the restoration and cultivation of that mode of treating religious doctrines, which makes more use of the holy scriptures and of the decisions of the fathers, than of metaphysical reasoning.(51) Yet the Scholastics could not be di-

(49) Concerning these, the reader may consult *Richard Simon's* Histoire critique du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament.—[Titelmann was of Hasselt, in the bishopric of Liege, a Capuchin monk, skilful in Oriental literature, and died provincial of his order in 1553. He left many commentaries on the books of Scripture, particularly one on the Psalms, which is not entirely useless. See *Rich. Simon*, Hist. crit. du Vieux Test., l. iii., c. 9, p. 422.—Isidorus Clarius (*de Chiara*) was bishop of Fuligno in Umbria, attended the council of Trent, and belonged to the Dominican order. He published notes on the Holy Scriptures, in which he attempts to correct the Vulgate. *Rich. Simon*, l. c., p. 320, expresses an unfavourable opinion of him, and pronounces him a plagiary.—Benedict Justinianus (*Justiniani*) was a Jesuit of Genoa, and died at Rome in the year 1622. He left expositions of Paul's and the Catholic Epistles.—John Gagnæus, a Parisian chancellor, published notes on the N. T. and a paraphrase on the Epistle to the Romans, of no great value. He died in the year 1549.—*Schl.*]

(50) *Adr. Baillet*, Vie de Edmund Richer, p. 9, 10, &c. [*Richer* was an eminent theological writer, well acquainted with the antiquities of the church, and a bold defender of the rights of bishops against the pope. But he suffered persecution, which ruined his health; and he died in the year 1631.—*Tr.*]

(51) See *C. E. de Boulay's* Reformatio Facultatis theol., Paris., anno 1587, in his Historia Acad. Paris., tom. vi., p. 790, &c. In this reformation, the *Baccalaurei Sententiarii* are distinguished from the *Baccalaurei Biblici;* and what deserves particular notice, the Augustinian monks (*Luther's* fraternity) were required, (p. 794), annually to present to the theological college *a Biblical Bachelor:* from which it may be inferred, that the Augustinian family (to which *Luther* once belonged) gave more attention to the study of sacred literature, than the other orders of monks. But as the work of *Boulay* is in the hands of but few, it may be proper to quote the statute entire: Augustinenses quolibet anno Biblicum præsentabunt, secundum statutum fol. 21, quod sequitur: Quilibet Ordo

vested of that ascendency which they had long maintained in the schools; nay, they seemed to have acquired new strength, after the Jesuits joined them and had decided that dialectics was more efficacious for confronting heretics than the holy scriptures and the authority of the fathers. The *Mystics*, as they were not very offensive to the enemies of the church, and were not much inclined to engage in controversy, lost nearly all their influence after the era of the reformation. Yet they were allowed to philosophize in their own way, provided they did it cautiously, and neither attacked too freely the decrees and the vices of the Romish church, nor inveighed too vehemently against either the futility of external devotion, or the metaphysical and polemic divines.

§ 28. Practical theology, no one among the Catholics of this century improved successfully; nor could any one improve it, without incurring the greatest opposition. For the safety of the church was supposed to forbid such attempts. And in reality, many doctrines and regulations on which the prosperity of the Romish church depends, would be brought into the greatest danger, if Christian piety in its true nature were uniformly held up to the view of the people. On the other hand, many honest men and cultivators of piety even in the Romish church, complain, (how truly and justly in all cases, I will not here inquire), that the Jesuits, as soon as they arose and began to have the ascendency in courts and in the schools, first sapped the foundations of all correct practical theology by their subtle distinctions, and then opened the door for all ungodliness and vice by the lax and dissolute morality which they inculcated. This infection indeed spread unobserved in this century, but in the next it appeared more manifest, and gave rise to the greatest commotions.—The moral writers of the Romish church moreover, may all be distributed into three classes, the *Scholastic*, the *Dogmatic*, and the *Mystic*. The first expounded the virtues and duties of the Christian life by knotty distinctions and phraseology, and obscured them by multifarious discussions; the second elucidated them by the language of the Bible, and the sentiments of the ancient doctors; the third recommended exclusively, withdrawing the thoughts from all outward objects, composing the mind, and elevating it to the contemplation of the divine nature.

§ 29. Of the vast multitude of papal polemic theologians, and of their capital faults, no one is ignorant. Most of them were abundantly fraught with all that is accounted criminal, in those whose sole object is victory and plunder. The numerous Jesuits who took the field against the enemies of the Romish church, excelled all the others in subtlety, impudence, and invective. But the chief and coryphæus of the whole, was *Robert Bellarmin*, a Jesuit, and a cardinal or one of the pontifical cabinet. He embraced all the controversies of his church, in several large volumes; and united copiousness of argument with much perspicuity of style. As soon therefore as he entered the arena, which was towards the close of the century, he drew upon himself alone the onsets and the strength of the great-

Mendicantium et Collegium S. Bernardi habeat quolibet anno Biblicum, qui legat ordinarie, alioqui priventur pro illo anno Baccalaureo Sententiario. It appears from this statute, that all the mendicant orders were bound, according to a decree of the college of theologians, to present annually a *Biblical Bachelor* (such as *Luther* was). Yet in this reformation of the college, the duty was required of none but the Augustinians. Who then, will not make the inference, that the Dominicans, the Franciscans, and the other mendicant orders wholly neglected biblical studies, and therefore had no *Biblical Bachelors*; and that the Augustinians alone, were able to fulfil this statute of the Sorbonne?

est men among the Protestants. Yet he displeased many of his own party, and chiefly because he carefully collected all the arguments of his antagonists, and generally stated them correctly and fairly. He would have been accounted a greater and better man, had he possessed less fidelity and industry, and had he stated only the feebler arguments of his opposers, and given them mutilated and perverted.(52)

§ 30. The Romish community, though it proudly boasts of its peaceful and harmonious state, is full of broils and contentions of every kind. The Franciscans and Dominicans contend vehemently, respecting various subjects. The Scotists and Thomists wage eternal war. The bishops never cease to wrangle with the pontiff and his congregations, respecting the origin and limits of their power. The French, the Flemings and others openly oppose the Roman pontiff himself, and his supremacy: and he inveighs against them as often as he deems it safe and necessary, with energy and spirit, and at other times cautiously and circumspectly. The Jesuits, as they from the beginning laboured successfully to depress all the other religious fraternities, and also to strip the Benedictines and others that were opulent of a part of their wealth, so they inflamed and armed all the fraternities against themselves. Among these, the Benedictines and the Dominicans are their most virulent enemies; the former fight for their possessions; the latter, for their reputation, their privileges, and their opinions. The contentions of the schools respecting various doctrines of faith, are without number and without end. All these contests the sovereign pontiff moderates and controls, by dexterous management and by authority, so that they may not too much endanger the church; to adjust and terminate them,—which would perhaps be the duty of a vicegerent of our Saviour,—he has neither power nor inclination.

§ 31. Besides these *minor* controversies which have slightly disturbed the peace of the church, other and *greater* ones since the times of the council of Trent, have arisen, chiefly through the influence of the Jesuits; which, being gradually increased and continued down to our times, violently agitate the whole Romish community, and rend it into numerous factions. These indeed the Roman pontiffs labour most earnestly, if not to extinguish, yet to quiet in a degree, so that they may not produce excessive mischief: but minds warmed not so much by zeal for the truth, as by the heat of controversy and the love of party, will not coalesce and become united.

§ 32. Whoever considers these controversies with attention and impartiality, will readily perceive that the Jesuits,—that is, the greater part of them or the fraternity in general, for in so very extensive a society there are those of different views,—guard and defend that ancient and rude but to the pontiffs and the church very useful system of faith and practice, which prevailed and was inculcated every where in the Romish church before the times of *Luther*. For those very sagacious men, whose office it is to watch for the safety of the Romish see, perceive clearly that the authority of the pontiffs and the emoluments, prerogatives, and honours of the clergy depend entirely on this ancient system of religion; and that if this was subverted or changed, the church must unavoidably suffer immense injury and gradually crumble to the dust. But, in the Romish church and especially since the reformation by *Luther*, there are not a few wise and

(52) See *Jo. Fred. Mayer's* Ecloga de fide Baronii et Bellarmini ipsis Pontificiis dubiâ, Amsterd., 1698, 8vo.

good men, who, having learned very clearly from the sacred scriptures and the writings of the ancient doctors, the deformities and faults of this ancient and vulgar system of religion, wish to see it corrected and amended, though in a different way; and who urge the extirpation of that mischievous darnel from the field of the church, which has armed the heretics against her. And hence those eternal contests and collisions with the Jesuits, on various subjects. All these contests however, may be reduced to the six following heads.

There is debate (I.) respecting *the extent and magnitude of the power of a Roman pontiff*. The Jesuits and their numerous friends, contend that a pontiff cannot possibly err, that he is the fountain and source of all the power which Jesus Christ has imparted to the church, that all bishops and religious teachers are indebted to him for whatever authority and jurisdiction they may possess, that he is not bound by any enactments of the church and its councils, and that he is the sovereign lawgiver of the church, whose decrees no one can resist without incurring the greatest guilt. But others hold, that he may err, that he is inferior to councils, that he is bound to obey the church, and its laws as enacted by councils, and that if he offends, he may be deprived of his rank and dignity by a council; from which it follows, that inferior prelates and teachers receive the authority which they possess from *Jesus Christ* himself, and not from the Romish prelate.

§ 33. There is debate (II.) respecting the *extent and the prerogatives of the church*. For the Jesuits and those who follow them, extend wide the bounds of the church. They contend that many among those who have no connexion with the Romish worship,(53)—nay, among the nations that are wholly ignorant of *Christ* and the Christian religion, may be saved, and actually are saved; they also hold, that sinners living within the church, are nevertheless its real members. But their adversaries circumscribe the kingdom of *Christ* within much narrower limits, and not only cut off from all hope of salvation those who live out of the Romish communion, but separate from the church all the vicious and profligate, though they live in it. The Jesuits moreover, not to mention other differences of less moment, hold that the church never can pronounce an erroneous or unjust decision, either as to matters of fact, or matters of doctrine and right (sive de facto, sive de jure); but their opposers believe, that the church is not secured from all danger of erring, in deciding on matters of *fact*.

§ 34. There is very warm debate (III.) respecting the *nature, operation, and necessity of that divine grace*, without which as all agree, no one attains to eternal salvation; respecting what is called *original sin, the natural power of man to obey the divine law*, and the *nature of God's eternal decrees* in regard to the salvation of men. For the Dominicans, the Augustinians, the followers of *Jansenius* and likewise many others, deny, that divine grace can possibly be resisted; deny, that there is any thing sound and uncorrupted in man; deny, that there is any condition annexed to the eternal decrees of God respecting the salvation of men; deny, that God wills the salvation of *all* men, and other kindred doctrines. On the other hand, the Jesuits and with them many others, would have it believed, that the extent and influence of the sin which lies concealed in man's nature, are not

(53) ["They were accused at Spoleto, in the year 1653, of having maintained, in their public instructions there, the probability of the salvation of many heretics. See *Le Clerc*, Biblioth. Univers. et Historique, tom. xiv., p. 320."—*Macl.*]

so great; that not a little power to do good is left in man; that so much divine grace is proffered to all men, as is necessary for the attainment of eternal salvation, and that by it no violence is offered to the mind; that God has from eternity, allotted eternal rewards and punishments, not according to his arbitrary pleasure, but according to the foreseen conduct and merits of individuals.

§ 35. There is debate (IV.) respecting various *points of morality* and *rules of conduct;* all of which as it would be difficult to enumerate particularly, and would besides be out of place here, we shall only state the commencement of the long controversy.(54) Those who take sides with the Jesuits, maintain that it is of no consequence by what motives a person is actuated, provided he in fact performs the deeds which the law of God requires; and that the man who abstains from criminal actions through fear of punishment, is no less acceptable to God than the man who obeys the divine law through the influence of love to it. But this doctrine appears horrible to very many, who deny that any services are acceptable to God, unless they proceed from love to him. The former assert that no one can properly be said to sin, unless he violates some known law of God, which is present to his mind, and correctly understood by him; and therefore, that no one can be justly charged with criminality and sin, who is either ignorant of the law, or doubtful as to its import, or who does not think of it at the time he transgresses. From these principles originated the celebrated doctrines of *probabilism*(55) and of *philosophical sin*,(56) which have brought so much ill-fame upon the schools of the Jesuits. The adversaries of the Jesuits detest all these principles strongly, and contend, that neither ignorance, nor doubts, nor forgetfulness, will afford any protection to the sinner at the bar of God. This controversy respecting the fundamental principles of morals, has given rise to numberless disputes concerning the duties we owe to God, to our fellow-men, and to ourselves; and has produced two sects of moralists, which have greatly disturbed and distracted the whole Romish church.

§ 36. There is debate (V.) respecting the *administration of the sacraments*, especially those of *penance* and the *Lord's supper*. The Jesuits,

(54) No one has treated of all the points objected against in the Jesuits' moral doctrines, with more clearness, neatness, and dexterity, and no one has plead the cause of the Jesuits with more ingenuity, than the eloquent and well-known Jesuit *Gabriel Daniel*, in his Entretiens de Cleandre et d'Eudoxe; which is among his collected Essays, tome i., p. 351, &c., and was composed, in answer to that great man and powerful adversary of the moral doctrines of the Jesuits, *Blaise Pascal*, whose Lettres Provinciales inflicted so great a wound on the Jesuits. *Daniel* treats very acutely on *probabilism*, p. 351; on the *method of directing the intention*, p. 556; on *equivocations and mental reservations* allowed of by the Jesuits, p. 562; on *sins of ignorance and forgetfulness* p. 719, &c., and on some other subjects. If the cause of the Jesuits can be defended and rendered plausible, it certainly is so by this writer.

(55) [Moral *probabilism* is properly the doctrine of the Jesuits, that no action is sinful, when there is the slightest *probability* that it may be lawful; and even when it has the approbation of any single, respectable teacher; because it may be supposed that *he* saw reasons for his opinions, though *we* know not what they were, and can see so many reasons for a contrary opinion.—*Schl.*]

(56) [*Philosophical sins* in opposition to theological, according to the Jesuits, are those in which a man at the time of committing them, has not God and his law before his mind; and therefore, without thinking of God, transgresses natural or revealed law. These sins, the Jesuits held to be *venial;* that is, such as do not draw after them a loss of divine grace, and do not deserve eternal but only temporal punishment.—*Schl.*]

with whom very many agree, maintain that the sacraments produce their salutary effects, by virtue of the mere external act (*ex opere operato*) as the schools express it; and hence, that no great preparation is necessary to the profitable reception of them; and that God does not require purity of heart and a soul filled with heavenly love, in such as would derive benefit from them; and they infer of course, that the priests should at once absolve such as confess their sins to them, and then admit them immediately to the use of the sacraments. Far different were the views of all those who had at heart the advancement of true piety. They thought, that the priests should long and carefully try those that applied for absolution and admission to the sacraments, before they complied with their wishes; because these divine institutions profit none but persons that are purified, and filled with that divine love which casteth out fear. And thus originated that noted controversy in the Romish church, respecting *frequent communion*; which in the last century, *Anthony Arnaud* (*Arnaldus*), author of the celebrated book on frequent communion [de la frequente communion], and the Jansenists, waged with the Jesuits; and which in our times has been renewed by the French Jesuit *Pichon*, to the great dissatisfaction of the French bishops.(57) For the Jesuits are very careful to urge upon all who intrust the guidance of their minds to them, the frequent use of the Lord's supper, as a sure and safe method of appeasing God and obtaining from him remission of their sins. But for this conduct they are strongly censured, not only by the Jansenists, but by many other grave and pious men; who inculcate that the sacred supper profits no one, unless his soul is united to God by faith, repentance, and love; and thus they condemn the famous *opus operatum* [or efficacy of the mere *external act* of communion].

§ 37. There is debate (VI.) respecting the right *method of training Christians*. While those who are anxious to advance *religion*, wish to have people imbued with a correct knowledge of religion from their very childhood; they who look rather to the interests of the *church*, recommend a holy ignorance, and think a person knows enough, if he only knows that he ought to obey the commands of the church. The former think nothing is more profitable than reading the inspired books, and therefore wish to see them translated into the popular or vulgar language: the latter prohibit the reading of the Bible, and esteem it pernicious, if published in any other than a learned language unknown by the people. The former compose various books to nourish a spirit of devotion and to dispel errors from the minds of men, they express and explain the public prayers and the solemn formulas of religion in a language understood by the community, and they exhort all to learn from these books how to be wise and to worship God rationally and properly; but the latter are displeased with all this, for they are apprehensive, the more light and knowledge people have the less obedience and submission will be found in them.(58)

(57) See the Journal Universel, tome xiii., p. 148; tome xv., p. 363; tome xvi., p. 124, &c.

(58) What we have said on the greater controversies in the Romish church, may be illustrated and confirmed from numberless books, published in the last and the present centuries especially in France and the Netherlands, by the Jansenists, the Dominicans, the Jesuits, and others. Nearly all those that attack the doctrines of the Jesuits and other partisans of the Roman pontiff, are enumerated by the celebrated French Jesuit *Dominic Colonia*: for it is ascertained that he composed the book, published without naming the place where, in the year 1735,

§ 38. Those of the preceding controversies which we have placed under the *third* head, namely, concerning divine grace, the natural power of men to do good, original sin, and predestination, actually exploded in this [sixteenth] century; the others were agitated more in private, and did not excite public notice till the next century. Nor will this surprise us, if we consider that the controversies moved by *Luther* respecting grace and free-will, were not explicitly decided in the Romish church, but were in a manner hushed and concealed. *Luther's* doctrines indeed were condemned; but no definite and fixed form of doctrine in regard to these subjects, was set up in opposition to them. *Augustine's* sentiments were also approved; but what the difference was between his sentiments and those of Luther, was never stated and explained. The commencement of this sad controversy may be traced to *Michael Baius*, a doctor in the university of Louvain, no less eminent for his piety than for his learning.(59) As he, like the Augustinians, could not endure that contentious and thorny method of teaching which had long prevailed in the schools, and as he in following *Augustine*, who was his favourite author, openly condemned the common sentiments in the Romish church respecting man's natural ability to do good and the merit of good works, he fell under great odium with some of his colleagues and with the Franciscans. Whether the Jesuits were among his first accusers or not, is uncertain; but it is certain, that they were then violently opposed to those doctrines of *Augustine*, which *Baius* had made his own. Being accused at Rome, *Pius* V., in the year 1567, in a special letter, condemned seventy-six propositions extracted from his books; but in a very insidious manner and without mentioning the name of *Baius*, for a recollection of the evils which resulted from the rash condemnation of *Luther*, was a dissuasive from all violent proceedings. By the instigation of *Francis Tolet* a Jesuit, *Gregory* XIII., in the year 1580, renewed the sentence of *Pius* V.; and *Baius* subscribed to that sentence, induced either by the fear of a greater evil, or by the ambiguity of the pontifical rescript, as well as of the propositions condemned in it. But

8vo, under the title: Bibliotheque Janseniste ou Catalogue Alphabetique des principaux livres Jansenistes ou suspects de Jansenisme, avec des Notes Critiques. His excessive zeal for the Roman pontiffs and for the opinions of the Jesuits, impaired his discretion; yet his book is very serviceable for acquainting us with those controversies which so greatly disturb and afflict the Romish church. The book was condemned by the Roman pontiff *Benedict* XIV., yet it was republished not long ago, in a new form and one fifth larger, with this title: Dictionnaire des livres Jansenistes ou qui favorisent le Jansenisme; in four volumes, Antwerp, 1752, 8vo. Undoubtedly the book is very useful, for acquainting us with the intestine divisions of the Romish church, the religious tenets of the Jesuits, and the numerous books published on the controversies I have mentioned; at the same time, it is full of gall and of unjust aspersions on many learned and excellent men.

(59) [*Michael de Bay* or *Baius*, D.D., was born at Melin in the territory of Aeth, in the year 1513, and educated in the university of Louvain, where he was elected in 1541 principal of a college, and in 1544 lecturer in philosophy. In 1550 he took his doctor's degree, and was appointed professor of the Scriptures. In 1563 he was sent by the king of Spain to the council of Trent, where he acted a conspicuous part. Soon after, charges of heresy were brought against him; which were renewed from time to time, notwithstanding his patient submission and silence, and must have given him much inquietude. Yet he retained his office through life, and was even promoted, for he became dean of St. Peter's at Louvain, and chancellor of the university. He died in 1589, aged 76. *Tolet*, a Jesuit, and his enemy, said of him: Michaele Baio nihil doctius, nihil humilius. His works, chiefly relating to the doctrines of grace, free-will, &c., were reprinted at Cologne, 1694, 4to. See *Bayle's* Dictionnaire hist. crit., art. *Baius*.—*Tr.*]

others who embraced the sentiments of Augustine, would not do so.(60) For to the present time great numbers in the Romish community, in particular the Jansenists, strenuously maintain that *Baius* was unjustly treated, and that the decrees of both *Pius* and *Gregory* are destitute of all authority, and were never received by the church.(61)

§ 39. It is at least certain, that the doctrines of *Augustine* in regard to grace, were as much esteemed and defended in the low countries, and especially in the universities of Louvain and Douay, after this controversy with *Baius* as they were before. This appeared at once, when the two Jesuits, *Leonard Less* and *Hamel* at Louvain, were found teaching differently from *Augustine* on the subject of predestination. For the theologians of Louvain and of Douay, forthwith, publicly disapproved their sentiments, the former in 1587 and the latter in 1588. And as the Belgian bishops were about to follow their example, and consulted about calling councils on the subject, the pontiff *Sixtus* V. interposed, asserting that the cognizance of religious controversies belonged exclusively to the vicar of *Jesus Christ* resident at Rome. Yet this crafty and sagacious pontiff prudently declined exercising the prerogative which he claimed, lest he should provoke a worse controversy. Hence his legate in the year 1588, terminated the disputes at Louvain by allowing each party to retain its own opinions, but absolutely prohibited all discussion respecting them either in public or in private. And the Romish church would have been more tranquil at the present day, if the succeeding pontiffs had imitated this prudence of *Sixtus* in silencing all discussion of the subjects, and had not assumed the office of judges in this dubious controversy.(62)

§ 40. The Romish community had scarcely tasted of this repose, when new and far more terrible commotions of a similar nature broke out. *Lewis Molina*,(63) a Spanish Jesuit who taught in the Portuguese university of Evora, in a book which he published in 1588 on the union of grace and free-will,(64) endeavoured to clear up in a new manner the difficulties in the doctrines concerning grace, predestination, and free-will, and in some sort to reconcile the discrepant sentiments of *Augustine*, *Thomas*

(60) Here should be consulted especially, the Baiana seu scripta quæ controversias spectant occasione sententiarum Baii exortas; subjoined to the works of Baius, as a second part of them, in the edition of Cologne, 1696, 4to. Add also *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire, [art. *Baius*], tome i., p. 457. *Louis Ell. du Pin*, Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, tome xvi., p. 144 &c. Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus, tome iii., p. 161, &c.

(61) To demonstrate this, is the professed object of the anonymous author of the Dissertation sur les Bulles contre Baius, ou l'on montre qu'elles ne sont pas reçues par l'Eglise, Utrecht, 1737, 2 vols. 8vo.

(62) See the Apologie Historique des deux censures de Louvain et de Douay, par *Mr. Gery*, 1688, 8vo. That the celebrated *Paschasius Quesnellus* (*Pasquier Quesnel*) was the author of this book, has been shown by the author of the Catechisme Historique et Dogmatique sur les contestations de l'Eglise, tome i., p. 104. *Jean le Clerc*, Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire des controverses dans l'Eglise Romaine, sur la predestination et sur la grace; dans la Bibliotheque Universelle et Historique, tome xiv., p. 211, &c.

(63) From him the name of *Molinists* quite to our times, has been given to all such as seem inclined to sentiments opposed to those of Augustine, respecting grace and free will in man. Many however, unjustly bear this name, as they differ much from the opinions of *Molina*.

(64) The true title of this celebrated book is, Liberi arbitrii concordia cum gratiæ donis, divina præscientia, providentia, prædestinatione et reprobatione; auctore *Lud Molina*. It was first printed at Lisbon, 1588, fol. Then, with enlargement, Antwerp, 1595, 4to, and at Lyons, Venice, and elsewhere. The third edition, farther enlarged, was printed at Antwerp, 1609, 4to.

Aquinas, the Semipelagians, and others.(65) The attempt of this subtle author, gave so much offence to the Dominicans who followed implicitly the teachings of *St. Thomas*, that they roused up all Spain, in which their influence was exceedingly great, and charged the Jesuits with a design to recall and give currency to the Pelagian errors. As a general tempest was evidently gathering, the pontiff *Clement* VIII., in the year 1594, enjoined silence on both the contending parties, and promised that after examining carefully the whole subject, he would judge and decide the controversy.

§ 41. The pontiff doubtless expected, that the evil would yield to these milder remedies, and that time would calm the feelings of the excited parties. But his hopes were entirely disappointed. The exasperated Dominicans, who had long indulged great hatred of the Jesuits, did not cease to harass the king of Spain, *Philip* II., and the pontiff, *Clement* VIII., until the latter, wearied with their importunate clamours, assembled a sort of council at Rome, to take cognizance of the dispute. Thus in the beginning of the year 1598, commenced those celebrated consultations on the contests between the Dominicans and the Jesuits, which from the principal topic of controversy, were called *Congregations on the Aids*, that is, *of grace* (Congregationes de Auxiliis, i. e., gratiæ). The president of them was *Lewis Madrusius* [*Madrucci*], a cardinal of the Romish court and bishop of Trent; with whom there were ten assessors or judges, namely, three bishops and seven theologians of different fraternities. These occupied the remainder of this century in hearing the arguments of the parties.(66) The Dominicans most strenuously defended the opinion of their

(65) [The first congregation at Rome for examining the sentiments in *Molina's* book, in their third session Jan. 16, 1598, thus state the fundamental principles of his work. (I.) *A reason or ground of God's predestination, is to be found in man's right use of his free-will.* (II.) *That the* GRACE *which God bestows to enable men to persevere in religion, may become the* GIFT *of perseverance, it is necessary that they be foreseen as consenting and co-operating with the divine assistance offered them, which is a thing within their power.* (III.) *There is a mediate prescience, which is neither the free nor the natural knowledge of God, and by which he knows future contingent events, before he forms his decree.* (*Molina* divided God's knowledge into *natural*, *free*, and *mediate*, according to the objects of it. What he himself effects or brings to pass, by his own immediate power or by means of second causes, he knows *naturally*, or has natural knowledge of; what depends on *his own free-will* or what he himself shall *freely* choose or purpose, he has a *free knowledge* of: but what depends on the voluntary actions of his creatures, that is, future *contingencies*, he does not know in either of the above ways, but only *mediately* by knowing all the circumstances in which these free agents will be placed, what motives will be present to their minds, and thus foreseeing and knowing how they will act. This is God's *scientia media*, on which he founds his decrees of election and reprobation.)—(IV.) *Predestination may be considered as either general*, (relating to whole *classes* of persons), *or particular*, (relating to *individual* persons). *In general predestination, there is no reason or ground of it beyond the mere good pleasure of God, or none on the part of the persons predestinated; but in particular predestination* (or that of individuals), *there is a cause or ground of it in the foreseen good use of free-will.* From this statement of the fundamental errors of *Molina*, it would appear that he embraced substantially the leading principles of the Semipelagians and of the Remonstrants at Dort. His *scientia media* was a new name for a thing well known before. See *Fleury's* Histoire Ecclesiastique, Continuè, livr. clxxxiii., § 5, vol. lii., p. 273, ed. Augsb., and *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. iv., p. 296, &c.—*Tr.*]

(66) The history of these Congregations has been repeatedly written, both by Jesuits and by Dominicans and Jansenists. Among the Dominicans, *Jac. Hyacinth Serris*, under the fictitious name of *Augustinus le Blanc*, published his Historia Congrega-

Thomas, as being the only true opinion. The Jesuits, although they refused to adopt the sentiments of *Molina* as their own, yet felt that the reputation and the honour of their order required, that *Molina* should be pronounced free from any gross error and untainted with Pelagianism. For it is common with all the monastic orders, to regard any disgrace which threatens or befalls a member of the fraternity, as bringing a stigma upon the whole order; and they will therefore exert themselves to the utmost, to screen him from it.

§ 42. Of the multitude of vain and useless ceremonies with which the Romish public worship abounded, the wisdom of the pontiffs would suffer no diminution, notwithstanding the best men wished to see the primitive simplicity of the church restored. On the other regulations and customs of the people and the priests, some of which were superstitious and others absurd, the bishops assembled at Trent, seem to have wished to impose some restrictions; but the state of things, or rather I might say, either the policy or the negligence of the Romish court and clergy, opposed their designs. Hence in those countries where nothing is to be feared from the heretics, as in Italy, Spain, and Portugal, such a mass of corrupt superstitions and customs and of silly regulations obscures the few and feeble rays of Christian truth yet remaining, that those who pass into them from the more improved countries feel as if they had got into midnight darkness.(67) Nor are the other countries, which from the proximity of the heretics or their own good sense are somewhat more enlightened, free from a considerable share of corruptions and follies. If to these things, we add the pious or rather the impious frauds, by which the people in many places are deluded with impunity, the extreme ignorance of the mass of the people, the devout farces that are acted, and the insipidity and the puerilities of their public discourses, we must be sensible, that it is sheer impudence to affirm that the Romish religion and ecclesiastical discipline have been altogether corrected and reformed, since the time of the council of Trent.

tionum de auxiliis gratiæ divinæ; Louvain, 1700, fol. In reply to him, the Jesuit *Livinus de Meyer*, assuming the name of *Theodorus Eluthérius*, published his Historia controversiarum de divinæ gratiæ auxiliis; Antwerp, 1705, fol. The Dominicans also published the work of *Thomas de Lemos*, (a subtle theologian of their order, who defended in these Congregations the reputation of *St. Thomas* [*Aquinas*] against the Jesuits), entitled: Acta congregationum et disputationum, quæ coram Clemente VIII. et Paulo V. de auxiliis divinæ gratiæ sunt celebratæ; Louvain, 1702, fol. From these historians, a man who possesses the power of divination may perhaps learn the facts that occurred. For here are arrayed, records against records, testimonies against testimonies, narrations against narrations. It is therefore still uncertain whether the Romish court favoured most the Jesuits, or the Dominicans; nor is it more clear, which of them most wisely and successfully managed their cause. There is also a French history of these congregations, written with ability; Histoire des congregations de auxiliis, par un Docteur de la Faculté de Theologie de Paris; Louvain, 1702, 8vo. But this, being written by a Jansenist and a bitter enemy of the Jesuits, states every thing just as the Dominicans would wish to have it stated. [Two of the continuators of Fleury's Ecclesiastical History, namely, *John Claude Faber* (a father of the oratory) and *R. P. Alexander* (a barefooted Carmelite) have also given a tolerably full, and apparently a candid account of the proceedings in these congregations.—*Tr.*]

(67) The French who travel in Italy, often laugh heartily at the monstrous superstition of the Italians. And on the other hand, the Italians look upon the French that come among them as destitute of all religion. This may be clearly perceived, among others, from the French Dominican *John Bapt. Labat's* Travels in Spain and Italy; who neglects no opportunity of satirizing the religion of the Spaniards and Italians, nor does he conceal the fact that he and his countrymen were considered by them as very irreligious.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE GREEK AND ORIENTAL CHURCH.

§ 1. Division of the Oriental Church.—§ 2. The proper Greek Church.—§ 3, 4. Is chiefly under the Patriarch of Constantinople, and divided into four Provinces.—§ 5. The Patriarch.—§ 6. The Religion of the Greeks.—§ 7. They were in vain solicited to unite with the Protestants.—§ 8. Their wretched State —§ 9. The independent Greek Church: that of Russia.—§ 10. The Georgians and Mingrelians.—§ 11. The Oriental Churches not connected either with the Greek or the Latin Church. The Jacobites.—§ 12. The Copts and Abyssinians.—§ 13. Doctrines and Rites of the Monophysites.—§ 14. The Armenians.—§ 15. The Nestorians or Chaldeans.—§ 16. Their Patriarchs.—§ 17. Remains of the Ancient Sects. The Sabians.—§ 18. The Jasidians.—§ 19. The Duruzi or Druzi.—§ 20. The Greeks who have revolted to the Romans.—§ 21. Vain Attempt to unite the Russian Church with the Roman.—§ 22. Romish Christians among the Monophysites, Nestorians, and Armenians.—§ 23. The Romish Missionaries effect little among them.—§ 24. The Maronites.

§ 1. WHAT is commonly called the *Oriental church*, is dispersed over Europe, Asia, and Africa, and may be distributed into three parts: (I.) That which is in communion with the Greek patriarch of Constantinople, and refuses the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff: (II.) That which differs in opinions and in customs, both from the Latin and the Greek patriarchs, and has its own peculiar patriarchs: (III.) That which is subject to the authority of the Roman pontiff.

§ 2. The church which is in communion with the Constantinopolitan patriarch, is properly called the *Greek* church; though it calls itself the *Oriental* church. It is moreover divided into two parts; one of which bows to the sovereign power and jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople, while the other though it is in communion with him, yet will not admit his legates nor obey his decrees and commands, but is free and independent, and has its own rulers who are subject to no foreign jurisdiction.

§ 3. The church of which the Constantinopolitan patriarch is the head, is divided, as it was anciently, into four great provinces, those of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Jerusalem;* over each of which is a prelate of the first rank called a *patriarch*, whom all the inferior bishops as well as the monks, honour as a father. Yet the chief of all the patriarchs and the supreme pontiff of the whole church, is the patriarch of Constantinople; by whom the other patriarchs at the present day, though still elected, are designated or nominated for election, and approved; nor dare they project or attempt any thing of great importance, without his sanction and permission. These well-disposed men however, though bearing the splendid title of *patriarchs*, are not able to attempt any thing great, as things are now situated, on account of the feeble state and the slender revenues of the churches they govern.

§ 4. The jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople extends widely over European and Asiatic Greece, the Grecian islands, Wallachia, Moldavia, and many other provinces in Asia and Europe now subject to the Turks. The patriarch of Alexandria, at present, generally resides at Cairo or Misra, and governs the Christian church in Egypt, Nubia, Libya,

and a part of Arabia.(1) The patriarch of Antioch resides for the most part at Damascus, and governs Mesopotamia, Syria, Cilicia, and other provinces.(2) The patriarch of Jerusalem styles himself patriarch of Palestine, Syria, Arabia, the region beyond Jordan, Cana in Galilee, and Mount Sion.(3) But these three patriarchs have very slender and poor dominions. For the Monophysites have long occupied the sees of Alexandria and Antioch, and have left very few members of the Greek church in the countries where they have dominion. And Jerusalem is the resort of Christians of every sect and doctrine, who have their respective prelates and priests; so that the dominion of the Greek patriarch there, is confined within moderate limits.

§ 5. The right of electing the patriarch of Constantinople, belongs at this day to the twelve bishops nearest to that city; the right of approving the election, and of imparting to the prelate authority to use his powers, belongs to the Turkish emperor.(4) But the corrupted morals of the Greeks, and the avarice of the ministers who under the emperor manage their public affairs, if they do not entirely subvert, greatly impair the effects of these regulations. For the lust of pre-eminence leads many of the bishops, to endeavour to obtain that patriarchal dignity by bribery, which they could never attain by the suffrages of their brethren. Thus, not unfrequently, men regularly elevated to the office, are deprived of it; and by the emperor's viziers, that candidate is generally esteemed most worthy of the office, who exceeds his competitors in the magnitude of his presents. Yet of

(1) Of the patriarchate and the patriarchs of Alexandria, the Jesuit *Jo. Bapt. Sollerius* treats professedly in his Commentarius de Patriarchis Alexandrinis; prefixed to the fifth vol. of the Acta Sanctor. mensis Junii; and *Mich. Lequien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. ii., p. 329, &c. Respecting their office, authority, and election, see *Euseb. Renaudot*, Diss. de Patriarcha Alexandrino; in the 1st vol. of his Liturgiæ Orientales, p. 365. The Greek patriarch [of Alexandria] at the present day, has no bishops subject to him, but only chorepiscopi. All the bishops are obedient to the Monophysite patriarch, who is the real patriarch of Alexandria

(2) Concerning the patriarchs of Antioch the Jesuits have inserted a particular treatise in the 4th vol. of the Acta Sanctor. mensis Julii; which however is considerably defective. On the territory of this patriarch and other things pertaining to him, see *Mich. Lequien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. ii., p. 670, &c., and *Blasius Tertius*, Siria sacra o Descrittione Historico-Geografica delle due Chiese Patriarcali, Antiochia et Gerusalemme; Rome, 1695, fol. There are three prelates in Syria, who claim the title and the rank of patriarchs of Antioch. The first is of the Greeks or *Melchites*, (for thus those Syrian Christians are called, who follow the institutions and the religion of the Greeks); the second is of the Syrian *Monophysites*; the third is of the Maronites. For this last also claims to be the true and legitimate *patriarch* of Antioch, and the Roman pontiff addresses him with this title. And yet the Roman pontiff creates a sort of patriarch of Antioch at Rome; so that the see of Antioch has at this day four prelates, one Greek, two Syrian, and one Latin or Roman *in partibus* as the term at Rome is. [This phrase is elliptical; entire, it is, *in partibus infidelium*. Patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops *in partibus infidelium*, are such as are created for places that are at present under the power of unbelievers.—*Schl.*]

(3) See *Blasius Tertius*, Siria sacra, lib. ii., p. 165. There is also a tract of *Daniel Papebroch*, de Patriarchis Hierosolymatinis, in the third vol. of the Acta Sanctor. mensis Maii. Add *Mich. Lequien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. iii., p. 102, &c. [It is well known, from other accounts, that these patriarchs contend with each other about the limits of their respective dominions. Hence it should not be regarded as an historical contradiction, that the patriarch of Jerusalem should include Syria in his *title*, while that province stands under the authority of the patriarch of Antioch.—*Schl.* This is a sufficient answer to *Dr. Maclaine's* criticism on this passage of *Mosheim.*—*Tr.*]

(4) See *Jac. Elsner's* Beschreibung der Griechischen Christen in der Türckey, chap. iii., sec. vi., p. 54, &c. *Lequien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. i., p. 145, &c.

late things are said to be changing for the better, and the patriarchs are represented as living more securely than formerly; since the manners of the Turks have gradually assumed a milder tone. Moreover this patriarch possesses great authority among a people oppressed, and in consequence of their extreme ignorance, sunk in superstition. For he not only summons councils, and by them regulates and decides ecclesiastical affairs and controversies, but by permission of the emperor he holds courts, and tries civil causes. His power is maintained partly by the authority of the emperor, and partly by his prerogative of excluding the contumacious from the communion; which is a punishment immensely dreaded by the Greeks. His support is derived principally from contributions imposed on the churches subject to his jurisdiction, which are sometimes greater and sometimes less, according to the varying state of things, and the necessity for them.(5)

§ 6. The Greeks acknowledge as the basis of their religion, the holy scriptures, together with the six first general or œcumenical councils. Yet it is a received principle, established by long usage, that no private person may presume to expound and interpret those sources of knowledge for himself, but all must regard as divine and unalterable, whatever the patriarch and his assistants sanction. The substance of the religion professed by the modern Greeks, is contained in *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Oriental church;* which was first composed by *Peter Mogilaus* bishop of Kiow, in a council held at Kiow; and was afterwards translated from Russian into Greek, and then publicly approved and adopted by *Parthenius* the patriarch of Constantinople, and by all the patriarchs, in the year 1643: and subsequently, *Panagiota*, an opulent man and interpreter to the emperor of Turkey, caused it to be printed at his own expense, in Greek and Latin, with a long recommendation by *Nectarius* patriarch of Jerusalem, and gratuitously distributed among the Greeks.(6) From this book it is manifest, that the Greeks differ as much from the adherents to the Roman pontiff whose tenets they often reject and condemn, as from other Christians; so that those are greatly deceived, who think

(5) *William Cuper* a Jesuit, not long since composed Historia Patriarcharum Constantinopolitanorum, which is printed in the Acta Sanctor. mensis Augusti. tom i., p. 1-257. *Mich. Le Quien* also, in the whole first volume of his Oriens Christianus, treats very fully of the patriarchate and the patriarchs of Constantinople; and in vol. iii., p. 786, &c., he gives an account of the Latin patriarchs of Constantinople. [In the Turco-Græcia of *Martin Crusius*, vol. ii., p. 105, &c., there is a history of the Constantinopolitan patriarchs, from the year 1454 to 1578, written in modern Greek by *Manuel Malaxi*, with a translation and notes by *Crusius.—Schl.* "See also a brief account of the power and revenues of the present patriarch, and of the names of the several sees under his spiritual jurisdiction, in *Smith.* de Ecclesiæ Græcæ Hodierno Statu, p. 48-59."—*Mucl.*]

(6) *Lawrence Normann* caused this confession, accompanied with a Latin translation, to be printed at Leipsic, 1695, 8vo. In the preface, *Nectarius* is represented as its author. But this is refuted by *Nectarius* himself, in his epistle subjoined to the preface. Equally false is the statement, both on the title-page and in the preface, that the book was now printed for the first time. For it had been previously printed in Holland, in the year 1662, at the expense of *Panagiota*. A German translation of it, was published by *Jo. Leonh Frisch*, Frankf. and Leipsic, 1727, 4to. *Jo. Christ. Köcher* treats directly and learnedly of this Confession, in his Biblioth Theologiæ Symbol., p. 45, &c., and also speaks with his usual accuracy, of the other Confessions of the Greeks, ibid., p. 53. A new edition of the *Orthodox Confession*, with its history prefixed, was published by *Chas. Gottl Hoffmann*, primary professor of theology at Wittemberg, Breslaw, 1751, 8vo. Of *Panagiota*, to whom this confession is indebted for much of its credit, and who was a man of eminence and a great benefactor to the Greeks, *Cantimir* treats largely, in his Histoire de l'Empire Ottomann, tome iii., p. 149, &c.

there are only slight impediments to a union of the Greeks with either the Romish or other Christians.(7)

§ 7. This the Catholics have often found to be fact; and the Lutherans also found it so, in this century, when they invited the Greeks to a religious union with them. First, *Philip Melancthon* sent a copy of the Augsburg confession in a Greek translation by *Paul Dolscius*, accompanied with a letter to the Constantinopolitan patriarch; hoping that the naked and simple truth would find access to his heart. But he did not even obtain an answer.(8) After this, between the years 1576 and 1581, the divines of Tubingen laboured to make impressions on the Greek patriarch *Jeremiah* II., both by letters and by sending him a second copy of the Augsburg confession, together with *Jac. Heerbrand's* Compendium of theology translated from Latin into Greek by *Martin Crusius*. This attempt drew from *Jeremiah* some letters, written indeed in a kind and gentlemanly style, yet of such a tenour as clearly indicated, that to induce the Greeks to abandon the opinions and practices of their ancestors would be a very difficult thing, and could not be effected by human efforts, in the present state of that people.(9)

§ 8. Ever since the greatest part of the Greeks fell under the hard bondage of the Turks, nearly all learning human and divine, has become extinct among them. They are destitute of schools, and of all the means by which their minds might be improved and enlightened with scientific

(7) A full and accurate catalogue of the writers from whom may be derived a knowledge both of the state and the doctrines of the Greek church, is given by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Bibliotheca Græca, vol. x., p. 441, &c. [To this list, may now be added archbishop *Platon's* Orthodox Doctrine, or Summary of Christian divinity; in, The present state of the Greek church, by *Rob. Pinkerton*, New-York, 1815, 12mo, p. 29, &c.—*Tr.*]

(8) See *Leo Allatius*, de perpetua consensione ecclesiæ Orient. et Occident., lib. iii., cap. viii., § ii., p. 1005, &c. [The patriarch of Constantinople, *Joseph*, sent a deacon of his church named *Demetrius* to Wittemberg, to procure correct information respecting the reformation of which he had heard reports. *Demetrius*, after a half year's residence at Wittemberg, returned to Constantinople in the year 1559; and by him it was, that *Melancthon* sent the confession and letter to the patriarch. The letter may be seen in *Hottinger's* Historia Eccles. [Pars v. seu] saecul. xvi., sec. ii., p. 51, and in *Martin Crusius*, Turco-Græcia, p. 557. See also *Salig's* Gesch. der Augsb. Confess., vol. i., p. 721, 723.—*Schl.*]

(9) All the Acts and papers relating to this celebrated correspondence, were published in one vol. fol., Wittemb., 1584. See *Christ. Matth. Pfaff's* Tract, de Actis et Scriptis publicis ecclesiæ Wittemberg., p. 50, &c. *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Biblioth. Græca, vol. x., p. 517, &c., and others. *Emm. a Schelstrate*, Acta eccles. Orientalis contra Lutheri hæresin; Rome, 1739, fol. *Jo. Lamy* also, has much to say on this subject, while treating of the Greek patriarch *Jeremiah* II. in his Deliciæ Eruditorum, tom. viii., p 176, &c. [This correspondence with the patriarch was much facilitated by *Stephen Gerlach*, chaplain to *David Ungnad* the imperial German ambassador at Constantinople. Its commencement however was not in 1576, but two years earlier. Indeed some private letters were sent as early as the year 1573; for in that year, *Crusius* wrote to *Jeremiah* by *Gerlach*, who also carried a letter of introduction to the patriarch, dated April, 1573. The public or official correspondence was commenced by *Jac. Andreas*, chancellor of the university of Tubingen, in a letter to the patriarch, dated Sept. 15th, 1574.—The patriarch expressly declared his agreement with many articles in the Augsburg Confession; but he also declared his dissent from many others; for example, in regard to the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, justification, the worship of images, the number of the sacraments, &c., and he broke off the correspondence, when the divines of Tubingen began to adduce scriptural proofs respecting the disputed articles. See *Schlegel's* note here; and *Schroeckh's* Kirchengeschichte seit der Reform. vol. v., p. 386, &c.—*Tr.*]

and religious knowledge. That moderate degree of learning which some of their teachers possess, is either brought home with them from Sicily and Italy, to which they frequently resort and where some love of learning still exists, or it is drawn from the writings of the ancients, and from the Summa theologiæ of *St. Thomas* [*Aquinas*] which they have in a Greek translation.(10) Hence, not only the people but also those called their watchmen, for the most part, lead licentious and irreligious lives; and what is much to be deplored, they increase their wretchedness by their own contentions and quarrels. Nearly the whole of their religion consists in ceremonies, which are in general useless and irrational. Yet in guarding and maintaining these they are far more zealous, than in defending the doctrines which they profess. Their condition however would be still more wretched, if individuals of their nation, who are employed in the emperor's court either as interpreters or as physicians, did not check their contentions and still the impending storms by their wealth and their influence.

§ 9. The *Russians*, the *Georgians* or *Iberians*, and the *Colchians* or *Mingrelians*, all embrace the doctrines and rites of the Greeks, yet are independent, or not subject to the authority of the patriarch of Constantinople. The *Russians* indeed formerly received their chief prelate at the hand of the Constantinopolitan patriarch. But towards the close of this century, when the Constantinopolitan patriarch *Jeremiah* II. made a journey to Muscovy, in order there to raise money with which he might drive *Metrophanes* his rival from the see of Constantinople, the Muscovite monks, by direction undoubtedly of the grand-duke *Theodore* son of *John Basilides*, beset him with entreaties and menaces to place over the whole *Russian* nation a patriarch, who should be independent or *ἀυτοκέφαλος* as the Greeks express it. *Jeremiah* was obliged to consent; and in a council assembled at Moscow in the year 1589, he proclaimed *Job*, the archbishop of Rostow, first *patriarch* of the Russians; yet under these conditions, that in future every new patriarch should apply to the patriarch of Constantinople for his consent and suffrage, and at stated periods should pay to him five hundred Russian ducats. The transactions of the council of Moscow,

(10) Such is the opinion of all European Christians, both Catholics and others, respecting the knowledge and learning of the modern Greeks; and they support their opinion, by the evidence of numerous facts and testimonies. But a number of the Greeks, most strenuously repel the charge of ignorance and barbarism brought against their nation; and maintain, that all branches of literature and learning are equally flourishing in modern, as they were in ancient Greece. The most distinguished of these vindicators of the modern Greeks, is *Demetrius Cantimir*, in his Histoire de l'Empire Ottomann, tome ii., p. 38, &c. To prove, that it is a gross mistake to represent modern Greece as the seat of barbarism, he gives a catalogue of learned Greeks in the preceding century; and states that an academy had been founded at Constantinople by a Greek named *Monolax*, in which persons very learned in the ancient Greek teach with success and applause all branches of philosophy, as well as the other arts and sciences. These things are undoubtedly true; but they only show, that in this very widely-extended nation, and which embraces many ancient, noble, and opulent families, there is not an entire destitution of literary and scientific men. And this fact was never called in question: but it does not prove that the nation at large, is rich in the liberal arts and in secular and religious learning. For a people generally barbarous, may still contain a small number of learned men. Moreover this academy at Constantinople, is unquestionably a recent institution; and therefore it confirms, rather than confutes, the opinion of the other Christians respecting the learning of the Greeks. [What is said above of the want of schools among the Greeks, must undoubtedly be understood of colleges and higher schools, and not of the inferior and monastic schools. For that the Greeks of the sixteenth century had schools of the latter description, is clearly to be seen from *Crusius*' Turco-Græcia.—*Schl.*]

were afterward in the year 1593, confirmed in a council at Constantinople, called by this same *Jeremiah* with the consent of the Turkish emperor.(11) And a little past the middle of the next century, *Dionysius* being patriarch of Constantinople, all the four Oriental patriarchs again conceded to the grand-duke of Muscovy, that the patriarch of Moscow should be exonerated from the tribute, and from applying for the confirmation of his election and consecration.(12)

§ 10. The *Georgians* and *Mingrelians*, or as they were anciently called, the *Iberians* and *Colchians*, are so fallen, since the Mohammedans obtained dominion over those countries, that they can scarcely be numbered among the Christian nations. This is more true however, of the *Colchians* who inhabit the woods and the mountains almost in the manner of wild beasts, than it is of the *Iberians*, among whom there are some slight remains of civilization and piety. These nations have a patriarch whom they style a *Catholic*, and also bishops and priests; but these are extremely ignorant, vicious, sordid, and worse almost than the common people; and as they know not themselves what is to be believed, they never think of instructing others. Hence it is rather to be conjectured than positively known, that the Colchians and Iberians at the present day do not embrace either the sentiments of the Monophysites or of the Nestorians, but rather hold the same doctrines with the Greeks. What little religion remains among them, consists wholly in their feast-days and their ceremonies; and even these are destitute of all gravity and decorum, so that it is hard to say, whether their priests appear most solemn when eating and drinking and sleeping, or when administering baptism and the Lord's supper.(13)

§ 11. The Christians of the East, who have renounced the communion of the Greeks, and who differ from them both in doctrine and in rites, are of two kinds. The one contend, that in our most holy Saviour there is but one nature; the other conceive, that there are two persons in him. The former are called *Monophysites*, and also *Jacobites*, from *Jacobus Baradæus*, who resuscitated and regulated this sect in the sixth century when it was nearly extinct.(14) The latter are called *Nestorians*, because they agree

(11) See *Anthony Possevin's* Moscovia; near the beginning. *Mich. Lequien's* Oriens Christianus, tom. i., p. 1292, and the Narrative of this transaction, by the patriarch *Jeremiah* II. himself, published in the Catalogus Codic. MSS. Biblioth. Taurinensis, p. 433–469.

(12) *Lequien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. i., p. 155, &c. *Nic. Bergius*, de ecclesia Moscovitica, pt. i., sect. i., cap. xviii., p. 164, &c.

(13) See *Clemens Galanus*, Conciliatio ecclesiæ Armenicæ cum Romana, tom. i., p. 156, &c. *Jo. Chardin*, Voyages en Perse et autres lieux de l'Orient, tom. i., p. 67, &c., where is *Jos Maria Zampi's* Relation de la Colchide et Mingrellie. Add *Archangel Lambert's* Relation de la Colchide ou Mingrellie; which is in the Recueil des Voyages au Nord, tome vii., p. 160. *Lequien*, Oriens Christianus, tom i., p. 1333, 1339, &c. Yet consult also *Rich. Simon's* Histoire Critique des dogmes et ceremonies des Chretiens Orientaux, cap. v–vi., p. 71, &c., who endeavours [and not unsuccessfully, *Tr.*] to wipe off some of the infamy cast upon the Georgians and Mingrelians. The *Catholici* of Georgia and Mingrelia are at this day *ἀυτοκέφαλοι* or independent; yet they pay tribute to the patriarch of Constantinople. [Their priests read the whole baptismal service through, and then apply the water, without repeating the words requisite. They consecrate the eucharist in wooden chalices; care not if crumbs fall on the ground; put the host into leather bags, and tie them to their girdles; send it by laymen to the sick; and do not accompany it with wax candles, processions, &c. Such are the *indecorums* complained of by the popish writers.—*Tr.*]

(14) We commonly use the name *Jacobites* in a broad sense, as including all the *Monophysites* except the Armenians; but it properly belongs only to those Asiatic Monophysites, of whom *Jacobus Baradæus* was the head and father. See *Rich. Simon's* Histoire de-

in sentiment with *Nestorius;* and also *Chaldeans*, from the country in which they principally reside. The *Monophysites* are again divided into those of *Asia*, and those of *Africa*. The head of the *Asiatic Monophysites*, is the patriarch of Antioch, who resides generally in the monastery of St. Ananias, now called the Zapharanensian monastery, not far from the city Marde; but sometimes at Amida, Marda (which is properly his episcopal seat), Aleppo, or other cities in Syria.(15) As he cannot alone govern conveniently the very extensive community, he has an associate in the government, to whose care are intrusted the eastern churches situated beyond the Tigris. This assistant is called the *maphrian* or *primate of the East;* and he formerly resided at *Tagrit*, on the borders of Armenia, but now resides in the monastery of St. Matthew, near the city Mosul in Mesopotamia.(16) At this day all patriarchs of the Monophysites assume the name of *Ignatius*.

§ 12. The *African Monophysites* are subject to the patriarch of Alexandria, who commonly resides at Cairo; and are divisible into the *Copts* and the *Abyssinians*. The *Copts* are those Christians who inhabit Egypt, Nubia, and the adjacent regions. Being oppressed by the power and the insatiable avarice of the Turks, they have to contend with extreme poverty, and have not the means of supporting their patriarch and bishops: yet these obtain a scanty living from such Copts as are taken into the families of the principal men among the Mohammedans, on account of their skill in domestic affairs and other useful arts, of which the Turks are ignorant.(17) The *Abyssinians*, though far superior to the Copts in numbers, power, and worldly circumstances, since their emperor is himself a Christian, yet reverence the patriarch of Alexandria as their spiritual father; and do not create their own chief bishop, but always allow a *primate* styled by them *abuna* to be placed over them by the Alexandrine patriarch.(18)

§ 13. The *Monophysites* differ in many points both of doctrine and of rites, from the Greeks, the Latins, and other Christians: but the principal ground of their separation from other Christians, lies in their opinion concerning *Jesus Christ* our Saviour. With *Dioscorus*, *Barsumas*, *Xenaias*, *Fullo*, and others whom they regard as the founders and lights of their sect, they believe, that the divine and human natures in Christ so coalesce as to become *one;* and therefore they reject the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, and the noted epistle of *Leo* the Great. Yet to avoid the appear-

Chretiens Orientaux, cap. ix., p. 118, whose narrative however needs many corrections.

(15) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman's* Dissertatio de Monophysitis, § viii., &c., in the 2d vol. of his Biblioth. Oriental. Clementino-Vaticana. *Faustus Nairon's* Euoplia fidei Catholicæ ex Syrorum monumentis, pt. i., p. 40, &c. *Lequien's* Oriens Christianus, tom. ii., p. 1343, &c.

(16) *Asseman's* Diss. de Monophysitis, § viii., &c.

(17) *Eusebius Renaudot* published at Paris, 1713, in 4to, his very learned Historia Alexandrinorum Patriarcharum Jacobitarum. He also published Officium ordinationis hujus Patriarchæ, with notes; in his Liturgiæ Oriental., tom. i., p. 467. The state and internal condition of the Alexandrine or Coptic church, are described by *Jo. Mich. Vansleb*, in his Histoire de l'Eglise d'Alexandrie, que nous appellons celle des Jacobites-Coptes, Paris, 1667, 8vo. Add his Relation d'un voyage en Egypte, p. 293, &c., where he treats expressly of the monks and monasteries of the Copts. Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus dans le Levant, tome ii., p. 9, &c., tome v., p. 122. *Bened. Maillet's* Description de l'Egypte, tome ii., p. 64, &c.

(18) See *Job Ludolf's* Comment. in Historiam Æthiopicam, p. 451, 461, 466. *Jerome Lobo's* Voyage d'Abissinie, tome ii., p. 36. Nouveaux Memoires des Missions dans le Levant, tome iv., p. 277. *Mich. Lequien's* Oriens Christianus, tom. ii., p. 641, &c.

ance of following *Eutyches*, with whom they profess to have no connexion, they cautiously define their doctrine, and denying all *confusion* and *intermixture* of the two natures, represent the nature of Christ as being indeed *one*, yet at the same time *compound* and *double*.(19) And this explanation shows us, that it is no rash opinion of some very learned men, that the *Monophysites* differ from the Greeks and Latins more in *words* than in substance.(20) The modern Jacobites both of Asia and of Africa, are in general so ignorant and illiterate, that they defend their distinguishing doctrine rather by blind pertinacity and the authority of their fathers, than by rational arguments.(21)

§ 14. The *Armenians*, though they hold to the same opinions with the other Monophysites respecting [the nature of] our Saviour, yet differ from them as to many practices, opinions, and rites; and hence, there is no communion between them and those who are appropriately called *Jacobites*.(22) The whole Armenian church is governed by three patriarchs. The chief of these, who governs the whole of the greater Armenia and the neighbouring provinces, has forty two archbishops under him, and resides in a monastery at *Echmiazin*. He might if he were disposed, live splendidly and luxuriously on the very ample revenues he receives;(23) but he is frugal in his table and plain in his dress, nor is he distinguished from the monks among whom he resides except by his power. He is usually elected by the suffrages of the bishops assembled at Echmiazin; and is approved by the king of Persia. The second patriarch or *catholic* of the Armenians, resides at *Sisi* a city of Cilicia, and governs the churches in Cappadocia, Cilicia, Cyprus, and Syria. He has twelve archbishops under him.

(19) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Clementino-Vaticana, tom. ii., p. 25, 26, 29, 34, 117, 133, 135, 277, 297, &c. See the acute defence of the doctrine of his sect by *Abulpharajus*, ibid., tom. ii., p. 288, &c. The system of religion embraced by the Abyssinians in particular, may be best learned in all its parts from the Theologia Æthiopica of *Gregory* the Ethiopian, published by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius* in his Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, p. 716, where also the other writers concerning the Abyssinians, are enumerated.

(20) *M. V. la Croze*, Histoire du Christianisme des Indes, p. 23. *Asseman*, loc. cit., tom. ii., p. 291, 297. *Rich. Simon*, Histoire des Chretiens Orientaux, p. 119. *Jo. Joach. Schröder*, Thesaurus linguæ Armenicæ, p. 276.

(21) The Liturgies of the Copts, the Syrian Jacobites, and the Abyssinians, have been published with learned notes, by *Eusebius Renaudot*, in the first and second volumes of his Liturgiæ Orientales.

(22) The chief writer concerning the Armenians, as well in regard to their religion as other matters, is *Clemens Galanus*, an Italian Theatine monk; whose Conciliatio ecclesiæ Armenicæ cum Romana, was published at Rome, 1650, &c., in 3 vols. fol. The other writers are mentioned by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, in his Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, cap. xxxviii., p. 640, &c. To his list, must especially be added *Lequien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. i., p. 1362, &c. The recent Histoire du Christianisme d'Armenie, by *M. V. la Croze*, subjoined to his Histoire du Christianisme d'Abessinie, à l'Haye, 1739, 8vo, does not correspond with the magnitude and importance of the subject. A far better account would have been given by this gentleman, who was so well informed on such subjects, if he had not been labouring under the infirmities of age. Respecting the singular customs and rites of the Armenians, see *Gemelli Carreri*, Voyage du tour du Monde, tome ii., p. 146, &c.

(23) A notice of all the churches subject to the chief patriarch of the Armenians, as communicated by *Uscan*, an Armenian bishop, is subjoined by *Rich. Simon*, to his Histoire critique des Chretiens Orientaux, p. 217, [in the English translation, by *A. Lovell*, Lond., 1685, p. 184, &c.] But we have noticed many defects in it. Respecting the seat, and the mode of life, of the patriarch of Echmiazin, see *Paul Lucas*, Voyage au Levant, tome ii., p. 347, and *Gemelli Carreri*, Voyage du tour du Monde, tome ii., p. 10, &c. See also the other travellers in Armenia and Persia.

This patriarch of Sisi, at present, acknowledges himself inferior to the patriarch at Echmiazin. The third and least of their patriarchs, who has only eight or nine bishops under him, resides on the island of *Aghtamar* in the middle of the great lake Varaspuracan, and is accounted by the other Armenians an enemy of the church. Besides these who are properly and truly called patriarchs, there are others among the Armenians who are patriarchs in name only, rather than in reality and in power. For the Armenian archbishop residing at Constantinople, whose authority is acknowledged by the churches in the neighbouring regions of Asia and Europe, is called a *patriarch*. So also the Armenian prelate at Jerusalem, is saluted with the same title; and likewise the prelate that resides at Kaminiec in [Russian] Poland, and who governs the Armenian churches in Russia, Poland, and the neighbouring countries. And these claim the title and the rank of patriarchs, because they have received from the great patriarch of Echmiazin, the power of ordaining bishops, and of consecrating and distributing every third year among their churches the sacred chrism or ointment, which none but patriarchs among the Oriental Christians, have a right to do.(24)

§ 15. The *Nestorians*, who are also called *Chaldeans*, reside principally in Mesopotamia and the adjacent countries. These Christians have many doctrines and customs peculiar to themselves: but they are chiefly distinguished from all other sects, by maintaining, that *Nestorius* was unjustly condemned in the council of Ephesus, and by holding with him, that there were not only two natures but also two persons in our Saviour. In ancient times this was regarded as a capital error; at this day it is considered by the most respectable men even among the Roman Catholics, as an error in words rather than in thought. For these Chaldeans affirm indeed, that Christ consists of two *persons* as well as two natures; but they add, that these two persons and natures are so closely united, as to constitute *one aspect*, or as they express it, one *barsopa;* which is the same with the Greek πρόσωπον [*person*].(25) From which it appears clearly, that by *aspect* they mean the same as we do by *person;* and that what we call *natures*, they call *persons*. It is to the honour of this sect, that of all the Christians resident in the East they have preserved themselves the most free from the numberless superstitions, which have found their way into the Greek and Latin churches.(26)

§ 16. Formerly all the Nestorians were subject to one patriarch or *catholic;* who resided, first at Bagdat, and then at Mosul. But in this [six-

(24) See the Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus dans le Levant, tome iii., where is given (p. 1–218) a long narrative respecting both the religious and the civil affairs of the Armenians; and which *la Croze* (than whom, no man within our knowledge has bestowed more attention on these subjects) very highly commends, for fidelity, accuracy, and research. See his Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie, p. 345, &c.

(25) It is thus that the inscriptions, which adorn the sepulchres of the Nestorian patriarchs in the city of Mosul, express their sentiments. See *Asseman's* Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. cmxlviii. See also, ibid., p. 210, &c. *Rich. Simon's* Histoire de la creance des Chretiens Orientaux, cap. vii., p 94, &c. *Peter Strozza*, de dogmatibus Chaldæorum; first published at Rome, 1617, 8vo.

(26) Here should especially be consulted, the very learned and copious dissertation of *Asseman* de Syris Nestorianis; which fills the whole of the fourth volume of his Bibliotheca Orient. Vaticana. It was from this chiefly, that *Mich. Lequien* took, what he says in his Oriens Christianus, tom. ii., p. 1078, &c.

teenth] century, they became divided into two parties. In the first place, as we have already noticed, in the year 1552 two patriarchs were elected by opposite factions, *Simeon Barmama* and *John Sulaka* or *Siud*. The latter of these, in order to obtain firm support against his antagonist, repaired to Rome and swore allegiance to the Roman pontiff.(27) To the party of this patriarch who stood connected with the Romish church, was added in the year 1555, *Simeon Denha* archbishop of Gelu; and when he afterwards succeeded to the patriarchate, he removed its seat to Ormia, in the mountainous parts of Persia; where his successors, all of whom assume the name of *Simeon*, have continued to reside till the present time. In the last [or seventeenth] century, they remained still in communion with the Romish bishop; but in this [eighteenth] century, they seem to have renounced that communion.(28) The greater patriarchs of the Nestorians, who stood opposed to this lesser patriarch, have since the year 1559, all borne the name of *Elias*, and had their residence at Mosul.(29) Their dominion spreads widely in Asia; and embraces the Nestorians in Arabia, and also those on the coast of Malabar, who are called *Christians of St. Thomas*.(30)

§ 17. Besides these sects of Christians, in which was something or at least some appearance of the religion taught by Christ, there were other far worse sects, scattered over a large part of Asia; which were undoubtedly descended from the Ebionites, the Manichæans, the Valentinians, the Basilidians, and other parties that in the early ages set up churches within the church, but which, through the common hatred against them of both Mohammedans and Christians, had sunk into such barbarism, ignorance, and superstition as to lose nearly altogether the reputation and the rights of Christians. The *Sabians* as they are called by the Orientals, or the *Mendai Ijahi*, i. e., *Disciples of St. John*, as they call themselves, or the *Christians of St. John* as they are called by Europeans, though they perhaps have some imperfect knowledge of *Christ*, seem to be a Jewish sect, and the descendants of the ancient *Hemerobaptists* mentioned by the early Christian writers. At least, that *John* whom they call the founder of their sect, was altogether unlike *John the Baptist*, and bore a far stronger resemblance to the *John* whom the ancients represented as the father of the Jewish *Hemerobaptists*.(31) They live in Persia and Arabia, especially at Bassora; and regard religion as consisting principally in frequent, solemn ablutions of the body, which their priests administer with certain ceremonies.(32)

§ 18. The *Jasidians*, *Jasidæans* or *Jezdæans*, of whom many uncertain

(27) [He planted himself at Caramit in Mesopotamia, and styled himself patriarch of the East. His successor *Ebedjesu*, attended the council of Trent. The next successor was *Abathalla*; and after him, was *Simeon Denha*, who was obliged to quit Caramit.—*Von Ein.*]

(28) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman's* Biblioth. Orient. Vaticana, tom. i., p. 538, and tom. ii., p. 436.

(29) A catalogue of the Nestorian patriarchs, is given by *Jos. Sim Asseman*, Bibliotheca Orient. Vaticana, tom. iii., pt. i., p. 611, &c., which he corrected, in tom. iii., pt. ii., p. cml. Add *Lequien's* Oriens Christianus, tom. ii., p. 1078, &c.

(30) Of these, *Mat. Veyss. la Croze* treats expressly, in his Histoire du Christianisme des Indes: with which should be compared, *Joseph Sim. Asseman*, loc. cit., tom. iii., pt. ii., cap. ix., p. ccccxiii.

(31) See what I have written on this subject, in my Commentaries, de Rebus Christian. ante Constantinum Mag., p. 43, &c.

(32) See the treatise of *Ignatius a Jesu*, a Carmelite who resided long among these Mendæans, entitled: Narratio originis, rituum et errorum Christianorum S. Johannis: cui

accounts are extant, are a vagrant branch or tribe of the fierce and uncultivated nation of the Kurds who inhabit the province of Persia called *Kurdistan*. They roam among the Gordian mountains and the desert parts of the country, and are divided into the *black* and the *white* Jezdæans. The former are the priests and the rulers of the sect, and always dress in black; the latter are the common people, whose dress is white. They have a singular religion, and one not yet sufficiently explored; yet it is clear, that it is a compound of Christian principles, with numerous fictions originating from other sources. They are especially distinguished from other classes of corrupted Christians, by their sentiments concerning the evil spirit; whom they call *Karubin* or *Cherubin*, that is, one of the greater ministers of God; and if they do not actually worship him, they at least treat him with respect, neither offering him any insult or contumely themselves, nor suffering others to do it. In this matter they go so far, that no tortures will induce them to express detestation of the evil spirit; and if they hear any other person curse him, they will kill him if they can.(33)

adjungitur Discursus per modum Dialogi, in quo confutantur xxxiv. errores ejusdem nationis; Rome, 1652, 8vo. *Engelb. Kæmpfer's* Amœnitates Exoticæ, fascic. ii., relat. xi., p. 435, &c. *George Sale's* Introduction to his English version of the Koran, p. 15. *Jos. Sim. Asseman's* Biblioth. Oriental., tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 609 *Thevenot's* Voyages, tome iv., p. 584, &c. *Barthol. Herbelot's* Bibliotheque Orientale, p. 725. *Theoph. Siegefr. Bayer* composed a particular treatise concerning the *Mendæans*, filled with much excellent matter; which, when he was about to commit to me for publication, he was suddenly cut off by death. It was *Bayer's* opinion, (as appears from the Thesaurus Epistolicus Crozianus, tom. i., p. 21), that they were a branch from the ancient Manichæans; which opinion was also approved by *La Croze*. See his Thesaurus Epistol., tom. iii., p. 31, 52. But there is nothing in their opinions or customs, that savours of Manichæism. Hence other learned men, (to whose opinion the celebrated *Fourmont* a few years ago acceded; in a paper published in the Memoires de l'Acad. des Inscript. et des Belles Lettres, tome xviii., p. 23, &c.), suppose them descended from the ancient worshippers of a plurality of gods, and especially of the stars, whom the Arabs call *Sabii*, or *Sabi* and *Sabiin*. But, except the name which the Mohammedans are wont to give them, there is nothing at all to support this opinion. The Mendæans themselves say, that they are Jews; and profess to have been removed from Palestine, to the places which they now inhabit. This sect has some sacred books which are very ancient; among others, what they call *The book of Adam*, and a book written by *John* the founder of their sect, and some others. As these books were introduced a few years since into the library of the king of France, it may be expected that from them, in due time, a better knowledge of this people will be obtained. [See the first volume of these Institutes, p. 35, note (7).—*Tr.*]

(33) See *Tho. Hyde's* Historia relig. veterum Persar. in the Append., p. 549. *Otter*, Voyage en Turquie et en Perse, tome i., p. 121; tome ii., p. 249, &c. To impart a better knowledge of religion to this people, journeys were made with great peril in the seventeenth century, by the celebrated and learned Jesuit *Michael Nau*, (*Laur. d'Arvieux*, Memoires ou Voyages, tome vi., p. 362, 377); and after him, by another Jesuit, *Monierius*, (Memoires des Missions de Jesuites, tom. iii., p. 291); but how these travellers were received, and what they accomplished, does not appear. *Jac. Rhenferd* considered the *Jezdæans* as the offspring of the ancient *Sethians:* (see *Gisb. Cuper's* Epistles, published by Bayer, p. 130), but in my opinion as groundlessly, as those who judge them to be Manichæans, a supposition which is sufficiently refuted by their opinion concerning the evil spirit. The name of this sect, *Isaac de Beausobre* among others, derives from the name *Jesus*. See his Histoire du Manicheisme, tome ii., p. 613. I should conjecture that it is derived rather from the word *Jazid* or *Jezdan*, which in Persian signifies *the good God;* to whom is opposed *Ahriman*, or the *evil* deity: (See *Herbelot*, Bibliotheque Orientale, p. 484, &c. *Cherefeddin Aly*, Histoire de Timurbec, tome iii., p. 81, &c.); so that *Jazidæans* denotes worshippers of the *good* or true *God*. Yet they may have derived their appellation from the celebrated city *Jezd;* of which *Otter* treats, Voyage en Turquie et en Perse, tome i., p. 283.

§ 19. The *Duruzi*, *Dursi*, *Druzi*, [or *Druses*], for their name is written variously, are a fierce and warlike people, inhabiting a large part of the rugged mountains of Libanus. They represent themselves (how justly, is uncertain) to be descended from those Franks, who waged war in the eleventh century with the Mohammedans.(34) As they cautiously conceal their religious creed, it is very dubious what their faith and worship are. Yet there are vestiges of Christianity sufficiently manifest in their customs and opinions. Learned men have suspected that the *Druzi*, as well as the *Kurds* that inhabit Persia, formerly held and perhaps still hold the doctrines of the Manichæans.(35)—The *Chamsi* or *Solares* inhabit a certain district of Mesopotamia, and are supposed by some, to be descendants of the *Samsacans* mentioned by *Epiphanius*.(36)—There are many other semi-Christian sects in the East:(37) and whoever will accurately trace them out, and introduce their sacred books into Europe, will doubtless re-

&c. [*W. Jowett*, in his Christian Researches in Syria, &c., ed. Boston, 1826, p. 55, &c., gives us from *Niebuhr*, the following account of this people, whom he met with, inhabiting a whole village near Mosul. "They are called *Yesidiens*, and also *Dauasin:* but as the Turks do not allow the free exercise of any religion in their country, except to those who possess sacred books, (as the Mohammedans, Christians, and Jews), the Yesidiens are obliged to keep the principles of their religion extremely secret. They, therefore, pass themselves off for Mohammedans, Christians, or Jews; following the party of whatever person makes inquiry into their religion. They speak with veneration of the Koran, of the Gospel, of the Pentateuch, and the Psalms; and when convicted of being Yesidiens, they will then maintain that they are of the same religion as the Sonnites. Hence it is almost an impossibility to learn any thing certain on the subject. Some charge them with adoring the devil, under the name of *Tscillebi*, that is to say, Lord. Others say that they exhibit a marked veneration for the sun, and for fire; that they are downright pagans; and that they have horrible ceremonies. I have been assured that the Dauasins do not invoke the devil; but that they adore God only, as the creator and benefactor of all men. They cannot, however, bear to speak of Satan, nor even to hear his name mentioned. When the Yesidiens come to Mosul, they are not apprehended by the magistrate, although known: but the people often endeavour to trick them; for when these poor Yesidiens come to sell their eggs or butter, the purchasers contrive first to get their articles into their possession, and then begin uttering a thousand foolish expressions against Satan, with a view to lower the price; upon which the Yesidiens are content to leave their goods, at a loss, rather than be witnesses of such contemptuous language about the devil. The Yesidiens practise circumcision like the Mohammedans." *Niebuhr*, Voyage en Arabie, vol. ii., p. 279, 280. From this account, it appears, that the *Jezdæans* are not that roaming, savage race, *Dr. Mosheim* supposed; but that they are a plain, frugal, conscientious people, who are afraid to avow their religious sentiments, because they have no sacred books, which would entitle them to toleration under the Turkish government. —*Tr.*]

(34) [See the Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses, tome i., p. 228–333, ed. à Lyon, 1819, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(35) See *Adrian's* Narrative concerning the Druses; in *Paul Lucas'* Voyage en Grece et Asie Mineure, tome ii., p. 36, &c. *Thom. Hyde's* Historia religionis Veter. Persarum, p. 491, 554. *Paul Rycaut's* Histoire de l'Empire Ottomann, tome i., p. 313, &c. [Modern researches particularly by *Chardin*, *De Sacy*, and *Burkhardt*, clearly show, that the *Druses* are with no propriety reckoned among Christian sects. They are apostate *Mohammedans*, followers of the false prophet *Hakem*, who pretended to be an incarnate deity. He was born at Cairo A.D. 985, began to reign in Egypt A.D. 996, and was assassinated in 1020. His *Charter* or commands to his followers, together with their oath of allegiance to him, are published by *De Sacy*, in his Chrestomathie Arabe, tome ii., p. 334, &c. See a full account of them in *W. Jowett's* Christian Researches in Syria, ed. Boston, 1826, p. 35, &c., 70, 83.—*Tr.*]

(36) *Hyde*, Historia relig. veter. Persarum, p. 555, &c.

(37) The Jesuit, *Diusse*, (Lettres edif. et curieuses des Missions etrangeres, tome i., p. 63), relates that, in the mountains which separate Persia from India, there resides a sect of Christians, who brand themselves with the figure of a cross, impressed with a hot iron.

ceive the grateful thanks of all that take an interest in Christian antiquities, for the various accounts we have of them at present, are contradictory and cannot be depended on.

§ 20. Among most of these sects [of Oriental Christians], the missionaries of the Roman pontiff have with great labour and expense established societies, which acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Latin pontiff. Among the Greeks, both those that are subject to the Turks and those that are subject to the Venetians, to the Roman emperor, and to other Christian princes, as is generally known, there are here and there Greeks that belong to the Romish church, and whose bishops and priests are approved at Rome. For the sake of preserving and enlarging these societies, a college is established at Rome, in which Greek youth that appear to possess genius and a disposition to study, are supported and instructed in the useful arts and sciences, and are especially taught to reverence the authority of the Roman pontiff. But the most respectable men, even among the friends of the Romish court, do not deny that these Greeks who are united with the Latins, if compared with those who hold the Latin name in abhorrence, are few and poor, and in a wretched condition; and that among them are persons of Grecian faith, who whenever opportunity is presented, repay to the Latins the greatest kindnesses with the greatest injuries. They also tell us, that the Greeks who are educated with great care at Rome, by witnessing the faults of the Latins, often become the most ungrateful of all, and the most strenuously oppose the advancement of the Latin interests among their countrymen.(38)

§ 21. For uniting or rather subjecting to the Romish church, the Russian which is the noblest portion of the Greek church, there have been frequent deliberations at Rome; but without success. In this [sixteenth] century, *John Basilides* grand-duke of the Russians, in the year 1580, sent an embassy to *Gregory* XIII., by which he seemed to exhort the pontiff to resume and to accomplish this business. The next year therefore, *Anth. Possevin* a learned and sagacious Jesuit, was despatched to Muscovy. But he, although he spared no pains to accomplish the object of his embassy, yet found himself unable to effect it: nor did the Russian ambassadors who a little after were sent to Rome, present any thing to the pontiff but vague and inefficient promises.(39) Indeed the result showed, that *Basilides* aimed only to secure by flatteries the favour of the pontiff, in order to succeed better in his unfortunate war with the Poles.—But the arguments of *Possevin* and others, had so much effect upon the Russians that inhabit Poland, that some of them in the convention of Bresty, A.D. 1596, entered into an alliance with the Latins. These were subsequently called the *United Greeks;* while the other party, which still adhered to the

(38) Here may be consulted, besides others, *Urb. Cerri's* Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 82, &c., where, among other things, it is said: Ils deviennent les plus violens ennemis des Catholiques, lorsq'ils ont appris nos sciences et q'ils ont connoissance *de nos imperfections.* [They become the most violent enemies of the Catholics, when they have been instructed in our sciences, and have knowledge of our imperfections.] Other testimonies will be adduced hereafter. A catalogue though an imperfect one, of the Greek bishops who follow the Latin rites, is given in *Lequien's* Oriens Christianus, tom. iii., p. 860.

(39) See the Colloquia *Possevini* cum Moscorum duce: and his other writings relating to this subject, which are annexed to his Moscovia, p. 31, &c., and *John Dorigny's* Vie du Pere Possevin, livr. v., p. 351, &c.

patriarch of Constantinople, were called the *Ununited*.(40) Moreover at Kiow, ever since the fourteenth century, there has been a society of Russians subject to the Roman pontiff, and which has had its own *metropolitans* or bishops, distinct from the Russian bishops of Kiow.(41)

§ 22. Among the *Monophysites* both the Asiatic and the African, the preachers of the Romish religion have effected but little that deserves attention. Among the Chaldean or *Nestorian* Christians, a small society subject to the Roman pontiff, was collected near the middle of the preceding century. Its patriarchs, all of whom take the name of *Joseph*, reside in the city *Amida*, which is also called *Caramit* and *Diarbeker*.(42) A part of the Armenians, as early as the fourteenth century in the pontificate of *John* XXII., embraced the Romish religion; and over them the pontiffs placed an archbishop in 1318, who was a Dominican monk and resided at Soldania,(43) a city of Aderbeitzan. The archiepiscopal residence was afterwards removed to Naxivan; and to this day, it is occupied exclusively by the Dominicans.(44) The company of Armenians resident in Poland and embracing the Romish doctrines, have also their bishop, who resides at Lemberg.(45) Some of the Theatin and Capuchin monks visited the Georgians and Mingrelians; but the ferocity and ignorance of those nations opposed such obstacles to the counsels and admonitions of the missionaries, that their labours were attended with almost no success.(46)

§ 23. The pompous accounts of their success among these sects given by the Romish missionaries, lack ingenuousness and truth. For it is ascertained by unquestionable testimony, that all they did in some countries, was merely to baptize by stealth certain infants, whom their parents committed to their care because they professed to be physicians;(47) and in other countries, they only gathered a poor, miserable company, who generally forsook them as soon as their money was gone, and returned to the religion of their fathers.(48) Likewise here and there a prelate among the Greeks or the other nations, would sometimes promise obedience to the Roman pontiff, and even repair to Rome in order to manifest his submission: but these were actuated only by avarice or by ambition. And therefore on a change in their circumstances, they would at once relapse, or would deceive the Romans with equivocal professions. Those who, like the Nestorian prelate at Amida, continue steadfast in their profession and

(40) *Adr. Regenvolscius*, Historia Ecclesiarum Slavonicarum, lib. iv., cap. ii., p. 465, &c., [and 470, &c.—*Tr.*]

(41) See *Mich Lequien's* Oriens Christianus, tom. i., p 1274, and tom. iii., p. 1126. Acta Sanctor., tom. ii., Februar., p. 639, &c.

(42) See *Asseman's* Bibliotheca Orient. Vaticana, tom iii., pt. i., p. 615, &c. *Lequien's* Oriens Christianus, tom. ii., p. 1084, &c.

(43) *Odor. Raynald's* Annales Eccles., tom. xv., ad ann. 1318, § 4.

(44) *Lequien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. iii., p. 1362 and 1403 &c. *Clemens Galanus*, Conciliatio ecclesiæ Armenæ cum Romana, tom i., p. 527, &c.

(45) Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus, tom. iii., p. 54, &c.

(46) *Urb. Cerri*, Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 162, &c

(47) *Urb. Cerri*, Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 164. *Gabr. de Chinon*, Relations nouvelles du Levant, pt. i., cap. vi., p., 174. This Capuchin monk speaks very ingenuously on many subjects.

(48) See *Jean Chardin*, Voyages en Perse, tome i., p. 186; tome ii., p. 53, 75, 206, 271, 349, and especially tom. iii., p 433, &c., of the last edition in Holland, 4to. For in the previous editions, every thing dishonourable to the Romish missions among the Armenians, the Colchians, the Iberians, or the Persians, was omitted. *Gabr. de Chinon*, Relations du Levant, pt. ii, p. 308, &c., where he treats of the Armenians. *Bened. Maillet*, Description d'Egypte, tome ii, p. 65, &c., who speaks of the Copts.

propagate it to succeeding generations, persevere from no other cause than the uninterrupted liberality of the Roman pontiff. The pontiffs, moreover, are astonishingly indulgent to those sons whom they adopt from among the Greeks and other Oriental Christians. For they not only suffer them to worship according to the rites of their fathers, rites the most diverse from those of the Romans, and to follow customs abhorred among the Latins; but they do not even require them to expunge from their public books those doctrines which are peculiar to them as a Christian sect.(49) At Rome, if we are not greatly mistaken, a Greek, Armenian, or Copt, is esteemed a good member of the Romish church, provided he does not call in question, but will acknowledge, the sovereign authority of the Romish prelate over the whole Christian church.

§ 24. The whole nation of the *Maronites*, who reside principally on the mountains of Libanus and Antilibanus, came under the dominion of the Roman pontiff from the period of the invasion of Palestine by the Latins.(50) But as they did this, on the condition that the Latins should change nothing of their ancient rites, customs, and opinions; hence almost nothing Latin can be found among the Maronites, except their attachment to the Romish prelate.(51) Moreover this friendship costs the pon-

(49) *Jos. Sim. Asseman* complains, here and there in his Bibliotheca Orientalis Vaticana, that not even the books printed at Rome for the use of the Nestorians, Jacobites, and Armenians, are purged of the errors peculiar to those sects; and he contends, that this is the reason why those people renounce the Romish religion, after having adopted it. Add *Rich. Simon's* Lettres Choisies, tome ii., lettre xxiii., p. 156, &c., who excuses this negligence or imprudence of the Romans.

(50) The Maronite doctors, and especially such as reside at Rome, take the utmost pains to prove, that the Romish religion has always been held and preserved by their nation, pure, and uncontaminated with any error. Besides others, *Faustus Nairon* has done this very elaborately, in his Dissertatio de origine, nomine ac religione Maronitarum; Rome, 1679., 8vo. From this book, and from other Maronite authors, *De la Roque* composed his long and well-written essay: Sur l'origne des Maronites et Abregé de leur Histoire; which is printed in his Voyage de Syrie et du Mont Liban, tome ii., p. 28–128, ed. Amsterd., 1723, 8vo. But the most learned men among the Catholics, do not give credit to this statement; but maintain, that the Maronites are the offspring of the Monophysites, and were addicted to the opinions of the Monothelites down to the twelfth century, when they united with the Latins. See *Rich. Simon's* Histoire critique des Chretiens Orientaux, cap. xiii., p. 146, &c. *Eusebius Renaudot.* Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinorum; preface, p. iii., z., and the history itself, p. 49: and many other writers. *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, himself a Maronite, advances a sort of intermediate opinion; Bibliotheca Orient. Vaticana, tom. i., p. 496. *Mich. Lequien* leaves the question dubious; Oriens Christianus, tom. iii., p. 1, &c., where he treats professedly of the Maronite church, and of its prelates. In my opinion, no one will readily put confidence in the Maronites, who like all Syrians are vainglorious, if he considers, that all the Maronite nation have not yet subjected themselves to the Roman pontiff. For some of this nation in Syria, stand aloof from communion with the Latins; and in the last century, not a few of them in Italy itself, gave the court of Rome no little trouble. Some of them went over to the Waldenses, inhabiting the valleys of Piedmont: others to the number of six hundred, with a bishop and many priests, went over to Corsica, and implored the aid of the republic of Genoa against the violence of the Inquisition. See *Urb Cerri*, Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 121, 122. I know not what could have excited these Maronites to make such opposition to the Roman pontiff, if they did not dissent at all from his doctrines and decrees; for the Romish church allows them freely to follow the rites and customs and institutions of their fathers. See the Thesaurus Epistol. Crozianus, tom. i., p. 11, &c., [and vol. i. of these Institutes, p. 427.—*Tr.*]

(51) Here consult, especially, the Notes which *Rich. Simon* has annexed to his French translation of the Voyage of *Jerome Dandini*, an Italian Jesuit to Mount Libanus, written in Italian; Paris, 1685, 12mo. See also *Euseb. Renaudot*, Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor., p. 548.

tiff dear. For as the Maronites live in extreme poverty under the tyranny of the Mohammedans, the pontiff has to relieve their poverty with his wealth; in order that their prelate and leading men may have the means of appeasing their cruel masters, supporting their priests, and defraying the expenses of public worship. Nor is the expense small, which is required by the college for Maronites established at Rome by *Gregory* XIII., in which Syrian youth are imbued with literature and with love to the Romish see. The Maronite church is governed by a patriarch, residing at *Cannobin* on Mount Libanus; which is a convent of monks that follow the rule of *St. Anthony*. He styles himself *Patriarch of Antioch*, and always takes the name of *Peter*, to whose see he claims to be the successor.(52)

PART II.

HISTORY OF MODERN CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

§ 1. Commencement of the Lutheran Church.—§ 2. Its Faith.—§ 3. Public Worship and Ceremonies.—§ 4. Ecclesiastical Laws and Government.—§ 5. Liturgy: public Worship: Education.—§ 6. Feast Days: Discipline.—§ 7. Prosperous and adverse Events.—§ 8. Cultivation of Learning among the Lutherans.—§ 9. Polite Learning and Languages.—§ 10. Philosophy.—§ 11. Philosophical Sects: Aristotelians: Ramists.—§ 12. Fire Philosophers.—§ 13. Hofmann's Controversy with his Colleagues.—§ 14. Theology gradually improved and perfected.—§ 15. State of exegetic Theology.—§ 16. Merits of the Biblical Expositors.—§ 17. Dogmatic Theology.—§ 18. Practical Theology.—§ 19. Polemic Theology.—§ 20. Three Periods of the Lutheran Church.—§ 21. Contests in Luther's Lifetime with Fanatics.—§ 22. Carolostadt.—§ 23. Schwenckfeld.—§ 24. His Opinions.—§ 25. Antinomians.—§ 26. Estimate of the Sentiments of Agricola.—§ 27. Contests after Luther's Death, under Melancthon.—§ 28. Adiaphoristic Controversy.—§ 29. That of *George Major*, respecting good Works.—§ 30. Synergistic Controversy.—§ 31. Flacius, the Author of many Dissensions.—§ 32. His Contest with Strigelius.—§ 33. His Disputation.—§ 34. Effects of his Imprudence.—§ 35. Controversy with Osiander.—§ 36. Controversy with Stancarus.—§ 37. Plans for settling these Disturbances.—§ 38. Crypto-Calvinists in Saxony.—§ 39. The Formula of Concord.—§ 40. It produces much Commotion, on the Part of the Reformed.—§ 41. Also, on the Part of the Lutherans.—§ 42. Proceedings of Duke Julius.—§ 43. New Crypto-Calvinistic Commotions in Saxony.—§ 44. Huber's Contest.—§ 45. Estimate of these Controversies.—§ 46. The principal Divines and Writers.

§ 1. The origin and progress of the church, which assumes the name of *evangelical*, for having rescued from oblivion the *Gospel*, or the doctrine of salvation procured for men solely by the merits of Christ, when it was smothered in superstition; and which does not reject the appellation

(52) See *Petitqueux*, Voyage a Cannobin dans le Mont Liban; in the Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus, tome iv., p. 252, and tome viii., p. 355. *La Rocque*, Voyage de Syrie, tome ii., p. 10. *Laur. D'Arvieux*, Memoirs ou Voyages, tome ii., p. 418, &c., and others. [See *W. Jowett's* Christian Researches in Syria, &c., p. 23, &c., ed. Boston, 1826, 12mo.—*Tr.*]

of *Lutheran*, as it would not be ungrateful to the man who first dissipated the clouds that obscured the gospel, and taught his followers to place no reliance on themselves and none on glorified saints, but to give all their confidence to Christ; we have already described, according to the method proposed. Its commencement is to be dated, from the time when *Leo* X expelled *Martin Luther* and his adherents and friends from the bosom of the Romish church [A.D. 1520]. It acquired a stable form and consistency in the year 1530, when the public confession of its faith was drawn up, and was presented to the diet of Augsburg. And it finally obtained the rank of a legitimate and independent community in Germany and was entirely freed from the laws and jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, in the year 1552, when *Maurice* of Saxony formed the religious pacification with *Charles* V. at Passau.

§ 2. According to the opinion of this church, the entire rule for a correct religious faith and for a holy life, is to be drawn exclusively from the books dictated by God himself; and it believes that these books, of course are so plain and so easy to be understood in respect to the way of salvation, that every man who possesses common sense, and who understands their language, can ascertain their meaning for himself, or without an interpreter. This church has indeed certain books usually called *symbolical* in which the principal truths of religion are collected together and perspicuously stated: but these books derive all their authority from the sacred volume, the sense and meaning of which they exhibit; nor may theologians expound them differently from what the divine oracles will permit. The first of these [symbolical] books, is the *Augsburg Confession*, with the *Apology*. Then follow, what are called the *Articles of Smalcald;* and next the *Catechisms* of *Luther*, the *larger* for adults and persons more advanced in knowledge, and the *shorter* intended for children. To these, very many add the *Formula of Concord:* which however some do not receive; yet without any interruption of harmony because the few things, on account of which it is disapproved, are of minor consequence, and neither add anything to the fundamentals of religion nor detract from them.(1)

§ 3. Concerning ceremonies and forms of public worship, at first there was some dissension in different places. For some wished to retain more, and others fewer, of the immense multitude of the ancient rites and usages. The latter, after the example of the Swiss, thought that every thing should give way to the ancient Christian simplicity and gravity in religion: the former supposed, some allowance should be made for the weakness and inveterate habits of the people. But as all were agreed that ceremonies depend on human authority, and that there is no obstacle to the existence of diversity as to rites in the churches and countries professing the same religion; this controversity could not long continue. All usages and regulations both public and private, which bore manifest marks of error and superstition, were every where rejected: and it was wisely provided, that the benefits of public worship should not be subverted by the multitude of ceremonies. In other respects, every church was at liberty to retain so many of the ancient usages and rites as were not dangerous, as a regard

(1) On the *symbolical* books of the Lutheran church and the expounders of them, *Jo. Christ. Köcher* treats expressly, in his Bibliotheca Theol. symbolicæ, p. 114, &c. [See also *J. G. Walch's* Introductio Historica et Theologica in libros symbolicos ecclesiæ Lutheranæ, Jena, 1732, 4to, p. 1008.—*Tr.*]

to places, the laws, and the character and circumstances of the people, seemed to require. And hence, quite down to our times, the Lutheran churches differ much in the number and nature of their public rites: and this is so far from being a dishonour to them, that it is rather good evidence of their wisdom and moderation.(2)

§ 4. In the Lutheran church, the civil sovereigns possess the supreme power in ecclesiastical affairs. This power is secured to them in part by the very nature of the civil government; and in part, I conceive, it is surrendered to them by the tacit consent of the churches. Yet the ancient rights of Christian communities, are not wholly subverted and destroyed; but in some places *more*, in others *fewer*, in all *some* traces of them remain. Besides, the civil sovereigns are prohibited by the fundamental principles of the religion they profess, from violating or changing at their own pleasure, the system of religion or any thing essential to it, or from legislatively imposing such creeds and rules of life upon the citizens as they may see fit. The boards, which in the name of the sovereigns watch over the interests of the church and direct ecclesiastical affairs, are composed of civil and ecclesiastical jurists, and bear the ancient name of *Consistories*. The internal regulation of the church, is in form intermediate between the *Episcopal* and the *Presbyterian* systems; except in Sweden and Denmark, where the ancient form of the church, with its offensive parts lopped off, is retained. For while the Lutherans are persuaded, that by divine right there is no difference of rank and prerogatives among the ministers of the gospel; yet they suppose it to be useful, and indeed necessary to the preservation of union, that some ministers should hold a rank and possess powers superior to others. But in establishing this difference among their ministers, some states are governed more, and others less, by a regard to the ancient polity of the church. For that which is determined by no divine law, may be ordered variously, without any breach of harmony and fraternal intercourse.

§ 5. Each country has its own *liturgy* or form of worship; in accordance with which, everything pertaining to the public religious exercises and worship, must be ordered and performed. These liturgies are frequently enlarged, amended, and explained, as circumstances and occasions demand, by the decrees and statutes of the sovereigns. Among them all, there is no diversity in regard to things of any considerable magnitude or importance; but in regard to things remote from the essentials of religion, or from the rules of faith and practice prescribed in the sacred scriptures, there is much diversity. Frequent meetings for the worship of God, are every where held. The services in them consist of sermons, by which the ministers instruct the people and excite them to piety, the reading of the holy scriptures, prayers and hymns addressed to the Deity, and the administration of the sacraments. The young are not only required to be taught carefully the first principles of religion in the schools, but are publicly trained and advanced in knowledge by the catechetical labours of the ministers. And hence in nearly all the provinces, little books, commonly called *Catechisms*, are drawn up by public authority, in which the chief points of religious faith and practice are explained by questions and answers. These the schoolmasters and the ministers follow, as guides in their instructions.

(2) See *Balth. Meisner*, de Legibus, lib. iv., art. iv., quæst. iv., p. 662–666. *Adam Scherzer's* Breviarium Hülsemann enucleatum, p. 1313–1321.

But as *Luther* left a neat little book of this sort, in which the first elements of religion and morality are nervously and lucidly expressed; throughout the church, the instruction of young children very properly commences with this; and the provincial *catechisms* are merely expositions and amplifications of *Luther's shorter catechism*, which is one of our *symbolical* books.

§ 6. As to holy days, in addition to the weekly day sacred to the memory of the Saviour's resurrection, the Lutheran church celebrates all the days which the piety of former ages consecrated to those distinguished events on which depend the divine authority of the Christian religion :(3) and also, that it might not offend the weak, it has retained some of those festivals which superstition, rather than religion, appears to have created. Some communities likewise observe religiously the days anciently devoted to the ambassadors of *Jesus Christ*, or to the *Apostles*. The ancient regulation, which has come down to us from the earliest age of the church, of excluding the ungodly from the communion, the Lutheran church at first endeavoured to purify from abuses and corruptions and to restore to its primitive purity. And in this [sixteenth] century, no one opposed the wise and temperate use of this power by the ministers of our church. But in process of time, it gradually became so little used, that at the present day scarcely a vestige of it in most places, can be discovered. This change is to be ascribed in part to the fault of the ministers, some of whom have not unfrequently perverted an institution in itself most useful, to the gratification of their own resentments, while others either from ignorance or indiscretion, have erred in the application of it; in part also to the councils of certain individuals, who conceived that for ministers to have the power of excluding offenders from church communion, was injurious to the interests of the state and to the authority of the magistrates; and lastly, in part to the innate propensity of mankind to licentiousness. This restraint upon wickedness being removed, it is not strange that the morals of the Lutherans should have become corrupted, and that a multitude of persons living in open transgressions should every where lift up their heads.

§ 7. The prosperous and adverse events in the progress of the Lutheran church, since the full establishment of its liberties and independence, may be stated in a few words. Its growth and increase have been already stated; nor could it easily, after what is called the religious peace, go on to enlarge its borders. Towards the close of the century, *Gebhard*, count of Truchsess and archbishop of Cologne, was disposed to unite with this [or rather with the *Reformed*] church; and he married, and attempted the religious reformation of his territories. But he failed in his great design,—which was repugnant to the famous *Ecclesiastical Reservation* among the articles of the religious peace; and he was obliged to resign his electoral dignity and his archbishopric.(4.) Neither on the other hand, could its

(3) ["Such, for example, are the *nativity*, *death*, *resurrection*, and *ascension* of the Son of God; the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles, on the day of Pentecost," &c. —*Macl.*]

(4) See *Jo. Dav. Köhler's* Diss. de Gebhardo Truchsessio; and the authors he cites. Add *Jo. Peter a Ludewig's* Reliquiæ Manuscriptor. omnis ævi, tom. v., p. 383, &c. Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1748, p. 484. [*Gebhard* was of Truchsess in Waldburg. After his change of faith he married, privately at first, *Agnes* countess of Mansfield; and he allowed the Protestants the free use of their religion, yet with the proviso that the rights of the archiepiscopal see should remain inviolate. But the chapter at the head of which was *Frederic* of Sach-

enemies greatly disturb the peace and prosperity of the church. Yet it was apparent from various indications, that a new war upon them was secretly plotted; and that the principal object aimed at, was to annul the peace of Passau confirmed at Augsburg, and to cause the Protestants to be declared public enemies. Among others, *Francis Burckhard* sufficiently manifested such a disposition, in his celebrated work *de Autonomia*, written in 1586; and also *John Pistorius*, in his *Reasons* by which *James* marquis of Baden professed to be influenced in abandoning the Lutheran party.(5) These writers and others of the like character, commonly assail the religious peace as being an iniquitous and unjust thing, because extorted by force and arms, and made without the knowledge and against the pleasure of the Roman pontiff, and therefore null and void; they also attempt to demonstrate, from the falsification or change of the Augsburg confession, of which they say *Melancthon* was the father, that the Protestants have forfeited the rights conferred on them by that peace. The latter of these charges gave occasion in this century and the following, to many books and discussions, by which our theologians placed it beyond all doubt, that this Confession had been kept inviolate and entire, and that the Lutherans had not swerved from it in the least.(6) But none felt more severely the implacable hatred of the papists against the *new* religion, (as they call that of the Lutherans), than those followers of this religion, who lived in countries subject to princes adhering to the Romish religion; and especially the Lutherans in the Austrian dominions, who, at the close of this century, lost the greatest part of their religious liberties.(7)

senlauenburg, refused obedience to him in the year 1583; and they were supported in their disobedience by the Spaniards. On the other hand, *Gebhard* obtained the promise of assistance from the Protestants assembled at Heilbron and Worms; yet only the palsgrave *John Casimir*, fulfilled the promise. For *Gebhard* was of the *Reformed* religion, and the contention between the Reformed and the Lutherans was then carried to a great height: otherwise, probably this business would have had a very different termination. The chapter applied to pope *Gregory* XIII., and having obtained the deposition of their archbishop, made choice of prince *Ernest* of Bavaria, who was already bishop of Freysingen, Hildeshiem, and Liege. The archbishop indeed sought to support himself. But *Augustus* elector of Saxony, hated the Reformed too bitterly, and needed the aid of the imperial court in the affair of the Henneberg inheritance too much, to be disposed to aid the archbishop; and *John Casimir*, who was threatened with the ban of the empire, dared not lead out *all* his forces, for fear of being abandoned by the other Protestant princes and becoming a prey to the Spanish and Bavarian army. *Gebhard* was therefore compelled, as he would not accept the terms proposed in the congress at Frankfort, to retire from the territory of the archbishopric; and he died in Holland, A.D. 1601.—*Schl.*]

(5) See *Christ. Aug. Salig's* Geschichte der Augsburgischen Confession, vol. i., book iv., c. iii., p. 767.

(6) Here *Salig* especially may be consulted, Gesch. der Augsb. Confess., vol. i. It must be admitted, that *Melancthon* did alter the Augsburg confession in some places. It is also certain, that in the year 1555 he introduced into the Saxon churches, in which his influence at the time was very great, a form of the confession very different from its original form. But the Lutheran church [in general] never approved this rashness or imprudence of *Melancthon*; nor was *his altered confession* ever admitted to a place among the *symbolical* books. [*Melancthon* doubtless looked upon the confession as his own production, which he had a right to correct and improve; and he altered in particular the tenth article, which treats of the Lord's supper, from a love of peace, and an honest desire to bring the Protestants into a closer union with each other, so that they might oppose their common enemies with their united strength. But his good designs were followed by bad consequences.—*Schl.*]

(7) See *Bernhard Raupach's* Evangelical Austria, written in German. [Evangelisches Oesterreich]. vol. i., p. 152, &c., vol. ii., p. 287, &c. [This was attributable especially to the influence of the Jesuits, who found ready access to the Austrian and Bavarian courts. At Vienna, *Peter Canisius*

§ 8. While the adherents of the Roman pontiff were thus plotting the destruction of the Lutherans by force and stratagems, *they* omitted nothing which might contribute in any way to strengthen and establish their own church. Their recent calamities were fresh in their recollection, which led them to the greater solicitude to prevent their recurrence: and to confess the truth, there was at that day more zeal for religion among men of distinction and high rank, than at the present day. Hence the confederacy for the defence of religion, which had been formed among the German princes, and of which the elector of Saxony was the head, was peculiarly strong and efficient; and foreigners, especially the kings of Sweden and Denmark, were invited to afford it their support. And as all were sensible that the church could not exist and prosper, unless its teachers were educated men, nor unless literature and science every where flourished; hence nearly all the princes set themselves to opposing the strongest barriers against ignorance the mother of superstition. Their zeal in this matter, is evinced by the new universities founded at Jena, Helmstadt, and Altorf, and among the Reformed at Franeker, Leyden, and other places; also by the old universities reformed, and adapted to the state and necessities of a purer church; by the numerous inferior schools opened in nearly all the cities; and by the high salaries for those times, given to literary and scientific men, as well as the high honours and privileges conferred upon them. The expense of these salutary measures was defrayed, for the most part, out of the property which the piety of preceding ages had devoted to churches, to convents of monks and canons, and to other pious uses.

§ 9. Hence almost every branch of human science and knowledge, was cultivated and improved. Greek, Hebrew, and Latin, all who aspired to the sacred office were required to study: and in these languages, it is well known, great men appeared among the Lutherans. History was greatly advanced by *Melancthon, John Cario, David Chytræus, Reinerus Reinecci-us*, and others. Of ecclesiastical history in particular, *Matthias Flacius* may properly be called the father; for he and his associates, by composing that immortal work the *Magdeburg Centuries*, threw immense light on the history of the Christians; which before was involved in darkness, and mixed up with innumerable fables. With him is to be joined *Martin Chemnitz*, to whose *Examination of the Council of Trent*, the history of religious opinions is more indebted than many at this day are aware. The history of literature and philosophy, the art of criticism, antiquities, and other kindred studies, were indeed less attended to; yet beginnings were made in them, which excited those who came after to prosecute successfully these pleasing pursuits. Eloquence, especially in Latin, both prose and poetic, was pursued by great numbers, and by those worthy of comparison with the best Latin writers; which is proof that genius for the fine arts and literature was not wanting in this age, but that it was the circumstances and troubles of the times, which prevented genius from attaining the highest excellence in every species of learning. *Philip Melancthon*, the common teacher of the whole Lutheran church, by his instructions, his example, and

rendered himself very conspicuous; and, on account of his great pains to hunt up heretics and drive them to the fold of the church, the Austrian Protestants called him the Austrian *hound*; but those of his own community, called him the second Apostle of the Germans. See Versuch einer neuen Geschichte des Jesuiterordens, vol. i., p. 372, 407, 468, and vol. ii. in various places.—*Schl.*]

his influence, enkindled the ardour of all those who acquired fame in the pursuit of literature and the fine arts; nor did scarcely an individual of those who prosecuted either divine or human knowledge, venture to depart from the method of this great man. Next to him, *Joachim Camerarius*, a doctor of Leipsic, took great pains to perfect and to bring into repute all branches of learning, and especially the fine arts.

§ 10. Philosophy met with various fortune among the Lutherans. At first, both *Luther* and *Melancthon* seemed to discard all philosophy.(8) And if this was a fault in them, it is chargeable to the account of the doctors of the schools, who had abused their barbarous method of philosophizing as well as the precepts of *Aristotle*, to pervert and obscure exceedingly both human and divine knowledge. Soon however, these reformers found, that philosophy was indispensably necessary to restrain the licentiousness of the imagination, and to defend the territories of religion. Hence, *Melancthon* explained nearly all the branches of philosophy in concise treatises written in a neat and perspicuous style; and these treatises were for many years read and expounded in the schools and universities. *Melancthon* may not improperly be called an *eclectic* philosopher. For while in many things he followed Aristotle, or did not utterly despise the old philosophy of the schools, he at the same time drew much from his own genius, and likewise borrowed some things from the doctrines of the Platonics and Stoics.

§ 11. But this simple mode of philosophizing, devised by *Melancthon*, did not long bear exclusive sway. For some acute and subtle men, perceiving that *Melancthon* assigned the first rank among philosophers to *Aristotle*, thought it best to go directly to the fountain, and to expound the Stagyrite himself to the students in philosophy. Others perceiving that the Jesuits and other advocates for the Roman pontiffs, made use of the barbarous terms and the subtilties of the old scholastics in order to confound the Protestants, thought it would be advantageous to the church, for her young men also to be initiated in the mysteries of the Aristotelico-scholastic philosophy. Hence near the close of the century, there had arisen three philosophical sects, the *Melancthonian*, the *Aristotelian*, and the *Scholastic*. The first gradually decayed; the other two insensibly became united, and at length got possession of all the professorial chairs. But the followers of *Peter Ramus* sharply attacked them in several countries, and not always without success; and at last, after various contests, they were obliged to retire from the schools.(9)

(8) See *Christ. August. Heumann's* Acts of the philosophers; written in German; art. ii., part x, p. 579, &c. *Jo. Herm. ab Elswich*, Dissert. de varia Aristotelis fortuna in scholis Protestantium; which he has prefixed to *Jo. Launoi*, de fortuna Aristotelis in Acad. Parisiensi; § viii., p. 15; § xiii., p. 36, &c.

(9) *Jo. Herm. ab Elswich*, de fatis Aristotelis in scholis Protestantium, § 21, p. 54, &c. *Jo. Geo. Walch's* Historia Logices, lib. ii., cap. i., sec. iii., § 5, in his Parerga Academica, p. 613, 617, &c. *Otto Fred. Schützius*, de Vita Chytræi, lib. iv., § 4, p. 19, &c. [*Ramus* was professor of eloquence at Paris, and wished to combine eloquence with philosophy. But as it would not coalesce with the scholastic philosophy, he devised a new species of philosophy, one which might be used in common life, at courts, and in worldly business. He separated from philosophy all the idle speculations which are useless in common life, and rejected all metaphysics. This innovation produced great disturbance at Paris. The Aristotelians opposed it most violently. And the king appointed a commission to investigate the controversy; from which *Aristotle* obtained the victory. From France this philosophy spread into Switzerland and Germany. At Geneva,

§ 12. The same fate was afterwards experienced by the *Fire Philosophers* (Philosophi ex igne), or the Paracelsists and the other men of like character, who wished to abolish altogether the peripatetic philosophy, and to introduce their own into the universities in place of it. At the close of the century, this sect had many eloquent patrons and friends in most of the countries of Europe, who endeavoured by their writings and their actions to procure glory and renown to this kind of wisdom. In England, *Robert a Fluctibus*, or *Fludd*, a man of uncommon genius, adorned and illustrated this philosophy by extensive writings, which to this day find readers and admirers.(10) In France, one *Riverius*, besides others, propagated it at Paris, against opposition from the university there.(11) Through Germany and Denmark, *Severinus* spread it with uncommon zeal;(12) in Germany also, after others, *Henry Kunrath*, a chymist of Dresden, who died in 1605;(13) and in other countries, others established it and procured it adherents. As all these combined the precepts of their philosophy with a great show of piety towards God, and seemed to direct all their efforts to glorifying God and establishing harmony among disagreeing Christians, they of course readily found friends. Just at the close of the century, they drew over to their party some persons among the Lutherans, who were very zealous for the promotion of true religion, as *Valerius Weigel*,(14) *John Arndt*,(15) and others; who feared, lest too much disputing and rea-

Beza would have nothing to do with it. At Basil it found more patrons. The most zealous adherents to *Luther*, who imitated him in hating *Aristotle*, nearly all took the side of *Ramus*. Hence, in our universities there was often fierce war between the Aristotelians and the Ramists, and it frequently cost blood among the students. Indeed the Calixtine contest originated from Ramism.—*Schl.*]

(10) See *Anth. Wood's* Athenæ Oxonienses., vol. i., p. 610, and Historia et Antiq. Academiæ Oxoniensis, lib. ii., p. 390. *Peter Gassendi's* examination of *Fludd's* philosophy; an ingenious and learned performance, in his Opp., tom. iii., p. 259, &c. [*Fludd's* appropriate work is entitled, Historia Macrocosmi et Microcosmi; Oppenh., 1617, 1619, 2 vols. fol.; and another, Philosophia Mosaica, Gouda, 1638, fol. He was a doctor of physic at Oxford; and died in 1637. *Fludd* and those of his class, assumed as a first principle, that men can never arrive at true wisdom, until they learn the ways of God in his works of nature; and that nature can be learned only by the analysis of fire. Hence they were called Fire philosophers; and they were all chymists. They combined their philosophical wisdom with theology. God who is unchangeable, said they, acts in the kingdom of grace, just as he does in the kingdom of nature; so that whoever understands how natural bodies are changed, in particular the metals, understands also what passes in the soul in regeneration, sanctification, renovation, &c. Thus they erected a sort of theology upon the basis of their chymical knowledge; and of course, no one can understand them, unless he is a chymist, or at least has a chymical dictionary before him.—*Schl.*]

(11) *Boulay's* Historia Acad. Paris., tom. vi., p. 327, and passim.

(12) *Jo. Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. i., p. 623, &c. [This Danish physician who spent a great part of his life in travelling, was one of the strongest supporters of *Paracelsus*, and first reduced his ideas to a system in a work entitled: Idea medicinæ philosophicæ. —*Schl.*]

(13) *Jo Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. ii., p. 440, &c. [His principal work is entitled: Amphitheatrum sapientiæ æternæ, solius, veræ, Christiano-Kabbalisticum, Divino-Magicum, Physico-Chymicum, &c. Hanau, 1609, fol., and Frankf., 1653.—*Schl.*]

(14) [This singular man was pastor of Tschoppau in Meissen, and died in 1588. After his death he was, perhaps unjustly, pronounced a heretic; partly because his language was not understood, and partly because much that appeared in his writings was not his, but was added by his chantor, who published his works after his death. He appears to have been an honest, conscientious man, without bad intentions, yet somewhat superstitious. See, respecting his life and writings, *Godfrey Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, vol. ii., book 7, ch. 17, and *Zach. Hilliger's* Diss. de vita, fatis, et scriptis Weigelii; Wittemb., 1721.—*Schl.*]

(15) [Of the history and life of this divine,

soning should divert men from the true worship of God, to run after the noisy and perplexing trifles of the ancient schools.

§ 13. Towards the same party also, leaned *Daniel Hoffmann*, a celebrated theologian in the university of Helmstadt, who in the year 1598 openly assailed all philosophy with great violence, and relying principally on certain passages and sentences in *Luther's* works, maintained that philosophy was the enemy of all religion and all piety, and moreover that there was a twofold truth, philosophical and theological, and that philosophical truth was falsehood in theology. Hence arose a fierce contest between him and the philosophers of the university in which he taught, namely *Owen Gunther*, *John Caselius*, *Conrad Martini*, and *Duncan Liddel;* and some out of the university, likewise took part in it by their writings. *Henry Julius*, duke of Brunswick, to put an end to the commotion, took cognizance of the cause, called in the divines of Rostoc for counsel, and ordered *Hoffmann* in the year 1601, to retract what he had written and spoken disrespectfully of philosophy and the philosophers, and to acknowledge publicly, that sound philosophy was in harmony with theology.(16)

§ 14. The theology which is now taught in the Lutheran schools, did not at once attain its present form, but was improved and perfected progressively. Of this fact those are aware, who understand the history of the doctrines concerning the holy scriptures, free-will, predestination, and other subjects, and who have compared the early systems of theology written by Lutherans with those of more recent date. For the vindicators of religious liberty did not discover all truth in an instant; but like persons emerging from long darkness, their vision improved gradually. Our theologians were also greatly assisted in correcting and explaining their sentiments, by the controversies in which they were involved, by their external conflicts with the papists, with the disciples of *Zwingle*, *Calvin*, and

to whom our church and the cause of piety are so much indebted, nothing need here be said, since his writings are in every one's hands, and many editions of them contain a biography of him. It is well known, that his writings gave occasion for violent contests; and for a long time, public opinion was divided respecting his orthodoxy and his merits. The chancellor of Tubingen, *Lucas Osiander*, and many others, could find gross heresies in his writings; but the provost *Bengel*, saw in him the Apocalyptical angel, with the everlasting Gospel. Iliacos intra muros peccatur et extra.—If a man will read *Arndt's* writings with the feelings of a dispassionate historian, he will hear one speaking in them, who is full of the spirit of Christianity, who abhors scholastic theological wrangling, and who speaks for the most part more forcibly, and more like the Bible, on practical Christianity, than his contemporaries do: yet he often sinks into a mysticism, which is not the mysticism of the Bible but of *Valerius Wiegel* and of *Angela de Foligny*, from whose writings he borrows largely. In proof of this, read only the third and fourth books of his *True Christianity;* where also many chymical terms occur, such as the Theosophists use; and to which *Arndt* had accustomed himself, having been a physician in early life, and retaining in after life a fondness for chymical writings. And for this reason, it is probably not so wise in our times, when we have so many ascetic works that are more easy of comprehension and better adapted to our age, to always recommend to common Christians the writings of *Arndt*. For the people of his times, his books were very valuable; but we should not therefore be ungrateful for those of our own age, which God has vouchsafed to us. Respecting him, see *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, vol ii., book xvii., ch. vi., § 5, &c., and *Weismann's* Historia Eccles. N. Test, tom. ii., p. 1174, &c.—*Schl*.]

(16) An accurate account of this controversy, and a list of the writings published on both sides, are given by *Jo. Möller*, in his life of *Owen Günther*, Cimbria Litterata, tom. i., p. 225, &c. See also *Jo. Herm. ab Elswich*, de fatis Aristotelis in Scholis Protestant., § xxvii, p. 76, &c. *Godf. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, book xvii., ch. vi., § 15, p. 947, &c.

others : and by their internal contests, of which we shall speak hereafter. Those who like *James Benignus Bossuet* and others, make this a reproach against the Lutherans, do not consider that the founders of the Evangelical church never wished to be regarded as inspired men, and that the first virtue of a wise man is to discover the errors of others, and the second is, to find out the truth.

§ 15. The first and principal care of the teachers of the reformed religion, was, to illustrate and explain the sacred scriptures ; which contain, in the opinion of the Lutheran church, all celestial wisdom. Hence there were almost as many expositors of the Bible among the Lutherans, as there were theologians eminent for learning and rank. At the head of them all, stand *Luther* and *Melancthon ;* the former of whom, besides other portions of the divine records, expounded particularly the book of Genesis, with great copiousness and sagacity ; the expositions of the latter on *Paul's* epistles, and his other labours of this kind, are well known. Next to these, a high rank among the biblical expositors was attained by *Matthias Flacius*, whose *Glosses* and *Key* to the holy scriptures were very useful for understanding the sacred writers ; by *John Bugenhagius*, *Justin Jonas*, *Andrew Osiander*, and *Martin Chemnitz*, whose *Harmonies* of the Gospels were of great value ; by *Victorinus Strigelius ;* and by *Joachim Camerarius*, who in his Commentary on the New Testament, acted the part merely of a grammarian, as he himself informs us ; or in other words, calling in the aid of polite literature in which he was well versed, he investigated and explained simply the import of the words and phrases, neglecting all theological discussions and controversies.

§ 16. All these interpreters of the holy volume, abandoned the uncertain and fallacious method of the ancients, who neglected the literal sense, and laboured to extort from the holy oracles by the aid of the fancy a kind of recondite meaning, or in other words, to divert them without reason, to foreign applications. On the contrary, it was their first and great aim, to ascertain the import of the words, or what it is they express ; adopting that golden rule of all sound interpretation which *Luther* first introduced, namely, that all the sacred books contain but one single meaning. Yet it must be confessed, that very many did not wholly lay aside the inveterate custom of extracting secret and concealed meanings from the language of the inspired writers, but were over wise in applying the oracles of the Old Testament prophets to our Saviour, and in eliciting from ancient history prefigurations of future events. Moreover, all the expositors of this century, may be divided, I conceive, into two classes. Some followed the example of *Luther*, who first explains in a free and familiar manner the import of the sacred text, and then makes application of it to theological controversies, to doctrines, and to practical duties. But others were better pleased with *Melancthon's* method ; who first divides the discourses of the inspired writers into their constituent parts, or analyzes them according to rhetorical principles ; and then closely and minutely surveys each part, rarely departing from the literal meaning, and but sparingly touching upon doctrines and controversies.

§ 17. *Philip Melancthon* first reduced the theology of the Lutherans to a regular system, in his *Loci Communes :* and this work, afterwards enlarged and amended by the author, was in such estimation, during this century, and even longer, that it served as the common guide to all teachers

of theology, both in their lectures and their written treatises.(17) The very title of the book shows, that the doctrines of revealed religion are not here arranged artificially, or digested into a philosophical system; but are proposed in that free and artless manner, which the genius of the author preferred. His mode of stating and explaining truth, especially in the earlier editions, is very simple and unencumbered with the terms, the definitions, and distinctions of the philosophers. For this first age of the Lutheran church, as well as *Luther* himself, wished to discard and to avoid altogether, the subtilties and syllogisms of the dialectic and scholastic doctors. But the sophistry of their adversaries and the perpetual contests with them, in process of time, caused this artless mode of teaching to be almost wholly laid aside. Even *Melancthon* himself led the way, by introducing gradually into his *Loci Communes* many things taken from the armory of the philosophers, with a view to meet the fallacies of opposers. And afterwards, when the founders of the church were no more, and when the Jesuits and others resolutely attacked the purified church with the old scholastic arms, this crafty mode of warfare had such influence upon our theologians, that they restored the thorny mode of explaining divine truth, which *Luther* and his companions had discarded; and employed in the explication of religious doctrines, all the intricacies and barbarism of the scholastic philosophy. Several very distinguished and excellent men near the close of the century, were exceedingly dissatisfied with this change, and bitterly lamented the loss of the ancient simplicity; but they could not persuade at all the teachers in the universities, to return to *Luther's* sober and artless method of teaching. For they said, necessity must govern us, rather than examples and authorities.

§ 18. That practical theology should be restored to its purity, by the same persons as exploded a corrupt doctrinal theology, might readily be supposed by such as understand the intimate natural connexion between them. And in fact, more may be learned respecting real piety, from the few writings of *Luther*, *Melancthon*, *Weller*,(18) and the two *Riviers*,(19)—not to mention others, than from all the volumes of the *casuists*, and the *moralizers* (moralisantes) as they were barbarously called. And yet, in this department also, all the truth did not at once show itself to those excellent men. It appears rather, from the various controversies agitated in this century respecting the extent of Christian duties, and from the answers which even great men gave to questions proposed to them respecting the divine law, that all the first and fundamental principles of Christian duty were not fully settled; nor was it universally understood, how far the law of nature and the precepts of Christianity coincide, and wherein they

(17) See *Jo. Fran. Buddeus*, Isagoge ad Theologiam, lib. ii., cap. i., § 13, vol. i., p. 381, and the authors named by him.

(18) [*Jerome Weller* was born at Freyberg in Meissen, was long familiar with *Luther* at Wittemberg, and died, the superintendent and inspector of schools in his native place, A.D. 1572. He was a practical theologian, and left many edifying and enlightened writings, which prove him a man of great experience.—*Schl.*]

(19) [There were two *Riviers*, both called *John*: the one was of Westphalia, and a famous schoolmaster of his times, who taught at Cologne, Zwickau, Annaberg, Schneeberg, and Freyberg; and was afterwards informator and counsellor to *Augustus*, elector of Saxony; and at last inspector of schools at Meissen. He died in 1553, and left many moral writings in Latin. The other *John Rivier* was of Venice, and lived near the same time; but whether he wrote anything on morals, I know not. See *Teissier's* Eloges des hommes savans, tome i., p. 153, &c., and *Melch. Adam's* Vitæ Germanor. philosophorum, p. 60, &c.—*Schl.*]

differ, or what there is in revealed religion consonant to the dictates of reason, and what that lies beyond the province of reason. If the fury of their numerous enemies had allowed the Lutheran doctors more leisure, and more opportunity to cultivate and diffuse religion, they would doubtless have been free from these faults, and would not have fallen below the more modern teachers. And the same answer may be given, to those who think it strange that no one, among so many excellent men,—not even *Melancthon*, who seemed formed by nature for such an undertaking,—should have thought of collecting and arranging the first principles of morals, and forming a system of practical religion, but should have included all his instructions under the heads of *the law, sin, free-will, faith, hope and charity*.

§ 19. To designate any one as a noted theologian of that age, is the same as to say, he was an ardent and energetic polemic. For the misfortunes of the times, and the multiplicity of contests both internal and external, required all to take up arms. Among these defenders of the truth, all that were contemporary with *Luther*, or who lived near his times, studied simplicity; nor did they assail their adversaries, except with the arguments afforded by the holy scriptures, and with the authority of the early fathers of the church. Those who flourished in the latter part of the century, came forth armed with the weapons of the Aristotelian philosophy; and therefore are less lucid. The cause of this change is to be sought for, in their adversaries, especially the papists. For these, having learned by sad experience that the plain and explicit mode of reasoning was ruinous to their cause, involved themselves and their opinions in all the absurdities and artifices of the scholastic doctors. And this led our theologians to think, that they must fight with the same weapons, with which they were attacked. Moreover all disputants of this age, if we except *Melancthon*, to whom Providence had given a mild and modest spirit, are thought at this day to have been much too bitter and acrimonious: and no one more so, than *Luther* himself, who inveighed against his adversaries, as is manifest, in the coarsest manner, and without regard to rank or dignity. Yet this fault will appear much alleviated, if it be estimated according to the customs of those times, and if compared with the ferocity and cruelty of his opposers. Is it not allowable to designate malignant railers and ferocious tyrants, who labour to destroy, and actually do destroy, with fire and sword, the holy souls which they cannot vanquish in argument, by applying to them the epithets appropriate to their crimes?

§ 20. The internal history of the Lutheran church, and of the changes that took place in it, if we would render the subject easy of comprehension and make the causes of events intelligible, must be divided into three periods. The first extends from the commencement of the reformation, to the death of *Luther* in 1546. The second embraces what occurred, between the death of *Luther*, and that of *Melancthon* in 1560. The third period contains the remainder of the century.—In the first period, every thing among the Lutherans took place according to the will and pleasure of *Luther;* who being a man of great energy of character, and possessing unbounded influence every where, suppressed without difficulty all commotions and disturbances that arose, and did not suffer nascent sects to attain maturity and acquire strength in his new community. Hence, so long as *Luther* lived, the internal state of the church was tranquil and peaceful;

and such as were disposed to foment divisions, had to be still, or else to retire beyond the bounds of the church, and seek residence elsewhere.

§ 21. The infancy of the new church was disturbed by a set of delirious fanatics, who turned the world upside down, and who imagined that they were moved by a divine afflatus to set up a new kingdom of Christ free from all sin. The leaders of this turbulent and discordant tribe, were *Thomas Munzer*, *Nicholas Storck*, *Mark Stübner*, and others, partly Germans and partly Swiss; who greatly disquieted some parts of Europe, especially Germany, and raised tumults among the ignorant multitude, in some places very great, in others less, but every where formidable.(20) The history of these people, is very obscure and perplexed: for it has not been methodically written, nor could it easily be so, if one were disposed to narrate it; because men of this sort, of dubious sanity, and differing variously from each other in opinions, every where roamed about; nor did the state of the times produce diligent recorders of such tumultuous proceedings. This however is certain, that the worst members of this motley company constituted that seditious band which produced the rustic war in Germany, and also that which afterwards disturbed Westphalia and settled itself at Munster; while the better members terrified by the miseries and slaughter of their companions, joined themselves at last to the sect called *Mennonites*. The resolution, vigilance, and zeal of *Luther*, prevented his community from being rent asunder by this sort of people, and kept the fickle and credulous populace from being deceived and led astray by them, as they would undoubtedly have been if he had possessed less energy of character.

§ 22. *Andrew Carolostadt*, a Frenchman and colleague of *Luther*, a man neither perverse nor unlearned though precipitate, was too ready to listen to this sort of men; and therefore in the year 1522, while *Luther* was absent, he raised no little commotion at Wittemberg, by casting the images out of the churches, and by other hazardous innovations. But *Luther* suddenly returned, and his presence and discourses calmed the tumult. Returning now from Wittemberg to Orlamund, *Carolostadt* not only opposed *Luther's* opinions respecting the Lord's supper, but in many other things also, showed a mind not averse from fanatical sentiments.(21) He was therefore expelled from Saxony, and went over to the Swiss; among whom he taught, first at Zurich and then at Basle; and as long as he lived, he showed himself inclined to the side of the Anabaptists, and of the men that made pretensions to divine visions.(22) This second commotion therefore *Luther* happily terminated in a short time.

(20) *Jo. Baptist Ott* has collected much relating to these events, in his Annales Anabaptist., p. 8, &c., and with him, may be joined nearly all the historians of the Reformation. [The *war of the peasants* in 1525, was noticed in sec. i., ch. ii., § 21, p. 37, &c., above: and that of the *Anabaptists* in Westphalia, A D. 1533, ibid., ch. iii., § 10, p. 58. The rise of the sect of *Mennonites* will be considered in the 3d chapter of this second part of the present section.—*Tr.*]

(21) See *Val. Ern. Löscher's* Historia motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformatos, p. i., cap. i. *Daniel Gerdes*, Vita Carolostadii, in his Miscell. Gröningens. novæ, tom. i., and most of the historians of the Reformation. [See above, p. 35, note (45).—*Tr.*]

(22) ["This affirmation of *Dr. Mosheim* wants much to be modified. In the original it stands thus: *Dum vixit vero Anabaptistarum, et hominum divina visa jactantium partibus amicum sese ostendit*; i. e., *as long as he lived, he showed himself a friend to the Anabaptists, and other enthusiasts, who pretended to divine inspiration.* But how could our historian assert this without restriction, since it is well known that *Carolostadt*, after his banishment from Saxony, composed a

§ 23. A man of similar turn of mind, was *Casper Schwenckfeld* of Ossigk, a Silesian knight, counsellor to the duke of Liegnitz; who, with *Valentine Crautwald* a learned man living at the court of Liegnitz, saw many deficiencies in *Luther's* opinions and regulations; and undoubtedly, if *Luther* and others had not strenuously resisted him, he would have produced a schism and a sect of considerable magnitude. For he led a blameless and upright life, recommended and laboured to promote piety among the people, with peculiar earnestness; and by these means so captivated very many even learned and discreet men, both among the Lutherans and the Zwinglians, that they thought it their duty to patronise him, and to defend him against his opposers.(23) But in the year 1528 he was banished by the duke, both from the court and the country; because *Zwingle* had declared, that *Schwenckfeld's* sentiments respecting the Lord's supper were not different from his own. From this time he wandered through various provinces, and experienced various fortunes, till his death in 1561.(24)

treatise against enthusiasm in general, and against the extravagant tenets and the violent proceedings of the Anabaptists in particular. Nay more; this treatise was addressed to *Luther*, who was so affected by it, that, repenting of the unworthy treatment he had given to *Carolostadt*, he pleaded his cause, and obtained from the elector a permission for him to return into Saxony. See *Gerdes*, Vita Carolostadii, in Miscell. Groningens. After this reconciliation with *Luther*, he composed a treatise on the eucharist, which breathes the most amiable spirit of moderation and humility; and, having perused the writings of *Zuingle*, where he saw his own sentiments on that subject maintained with the greatest perspicuity and force of evidence, he repaired, a second time, to *Zurich*, and from thence to Basil, where he was admitted to the offices of pastor and professor of divinity, and where, after having lived in the exemplary and constant practice of every Christian virtue, he died, amidst the warmest effusions of piety and resignation, on the 25th of December, 1541. All this is testified solemnly in a letter of the learned and pious *Grynæus* of Basil to *Pitiscus*, chaplain to the elector Palatine, and shows how little credit ought to be given to the assertions of the ignorant *Moreri*, or to the insinuations of the insidious *Bossuet*."—*Macl.*]

(23) See *Jo. Conrad Fueslin's* Centuria I. Epistolarum a Reformator. Helvet. scriptarum, p. 169, 175, 225. Museum Helvet., tom. iv., p. 445, &c.

(24) *Jo. Wigand's* Schwenckfeldianismus, Lips., 1586, 4to. *Conrad Schlüsselburg's* whole tenth Book of his Catalogus Hæreticorum, Frankf., 1599, 8vo. But the history of *Schwenckfeld* is most studiously investigated, and accompanied with vindications of him, by *Godfrey Arnold*, Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, book xvi., ch. xx., p. 720, &c., [vol. i., p. 835–856, and p. 1246–1292, ed. Schaffhausen, 1740, fol.—*Tr.*], and by *Chr. Aug. Salig*, Geschichte der Augsb. Confession, vol. iii., book xi., p. 951, &c. [*Schwenckfeld* was born in the year 1490, and was employed in the courts of Münsterberg and Liegnitz, and held a canonry at Liegnitz. He aided the reformation in Silesia: but *Luther's* reformation, in his view, did not go far enough. He not only wished for a stricter church discipline, but he also found some fault with certain points of doctrine. As early as the year 1524, he commenced an attack upon the Evangelical church, by his essay on the Abuse of the Gospel to carnal security; and the year following, he brought forward his new opinion respecting the eucharist. According to the epistle of the superintendent of Liegnitz, *Simon Grunæus*, to *Abraham Scultetus* of Heidelberg, (in the Supplem. ad Ind. i. histor., No. 28, of *Seckendorf's* Historia Lutheranismi), it was not merely the duke that banished *Schwenckfeld* from Silesia, but also *Ferdinand*, king of the Romans. He seems to have drawn on himself the hatred of this lord, chiefly, by his opinion concerning the eucharist; which he defended in the year 1529, by a writing printed at Liegnitz, with a preface by *Capito*. From Silesia he retired to Strasburg, where he was supported for some time by the preachers, *Matthew Zell* and *Capito*. Afterwards he resided in several imperial cities of Swabia; and died at Ulm, in 1561, after having obtained many followers in Alsace, the territory of Würtemberg, and other places. His writings were at first printed separately; but after his death, collectively, at two different times, namely in 1564, in two Parts, or 4 vols. fol., and in 1592, in 4 large vols. 4to. The greater part of them were also published in 1566, fol., under the title of Epistolar des

He left a little community in his native Silesia; whom the papists, in our own times, ordered to quit the country, but whom the king of Prussia in the year 1742, permitted to return to their former habitations.(25)

§ 24. *Schwenckfeld* merits the praise of good intentions, piety, and zeal for promoting religion; but not the praise of discretion, sound judgment, and intelligence. The good man inclined towards what is called fanaticism; and he supposed that he was taught by the Spirit of God. From *Luther* and the other professors of the reformed religion, he differed principally on three points: for I pass over inferences from his principles, and minor points of doctrine.—(I.) In regard to the Lord's supper: he inverted the words of Christ, *This is my body;* and would have them understood thus: *My body is this*, that is, is such as this bread which is broken and eaten; or, it is real food for the soul, nourishes, satisfies, delights it. And, *my blood is this*, namely, like wine, which refreshes and strengthens the soul. And this singular doctrine, he said, had been divinely communicated to him; which alone shows how weak his mind and discernment were.(26) (II.) In regard to the efficacy of the word of God: he denied

edlen von Gott hochbegnadigten theueren Mannes Caspar Schwenckfeld von Ossing, &c. Besides these, he left various manuscripts, which are in the Wolfenbuttle library, and which *Salig* consulted. One tolerable and devotional tract, is on the Love of God, and was printed at Amsterdam, 1594, 8vo.—*Crautwald* was a professor and a pastor at Liegnitz, a promoter of the reformation, but who afterwards took sides with *Schwenckfeld*, participated in his views of the eucharist, and published various writings, under the name of *Valentine Cratoald*. Other adherents to *Schwenckfeld*, were *Jo Sigm. Werner*, court preacher to the duke of Liegnitz; who was displaced in 1540, after being sent by the duke to Wittemberg to be better instructed by *Luther* and *Melancthon*. He now retired to the county of Glatz, where he established a school at Rengersdorf, and composed a Catechism and a Postille, under the name of *Siegm. Rengersdorfer*. The catechism is still regarded by the Schwenckfelders as one of their best elementary books; and the postille is often used in their religious worship. Besides these, in the middle of the following century lived one *Daniel Frederic*, who in 1643 published the Secret of self-examination. See concerning him, *Godfrey Arnold*, l. c., vol. iv., § ii., No. 24.—*Schl.*]

(25) On the Confessions of the Schwenckfelders, see *Jo. Chr. Köcher's* Biblioth. Theol. Symbolicæ, p. 457. [Most of the Schwenckfelders joined the body, after the death of *Schwenckfeld*, when the concealed Protestants in Bohemia, the county of Glatz, and Silesia, obtained possession of his writings, which were spread abroad in great numbers; and they established congregations, principally, in the territories of Liegnitz, Hirschberg, and Goldberg. But as they were often severely persecuted under the Austrian government, especially since the year 1718, and were harassed by the Jesuit missionaries; hence the greater part of them retired to Pennsylvania, where they set up congregations, and held communion with other fanatical parties. Others who remained in the vicinity, being invited back, returned when the country fell under the Prussian government. See *Baumgarten's* Geschichte der Religions-Parteyen, p. 1059, &c.—*Schl.*]

(26) [He also discarded infant baptism; though he did not require those baptized in infancy, to be rebaptized; and therefore differed in this from the Anabaptists. Hence *Grunæus* informs us, (in *Seckendorf's* Hist. Lutheranismi, Supplem. ad Ind. i., No. 28), that in the year 1526, infant baptism was nearly done away among the Schwenckfelders.—*Schl.* The Lutheran writers thus tax *Schwenckfeld* with discarding infant baptism. The fact was, he placed no reliance upon any outward rites, for the salvation of the soul; and was strongly opposed to the prevailing idea, that water baptism was necessary to the salvation of any one. Baptism in the blood of Christ, or spiritual baptism, was everything, in his estimation. And he deemed it proper, though not essential, that this spiritual baptism should precede water baptism. See *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, book xvi., ch. xx., § 13, 14, vol. i., p. 842, &c., and p. 1271. Neither does *Grunæus*, (in the passage in *Seckendorf*, mentioned by *Schlegel*), intimate that *Schwenckfeld* treated infant baptism with any greater neglect or disrespect, than he did the Lord's Supper and other external rites. His words are these: Eo vero, anno 1526, progredi cœpit fanaticorum in-

that there is efficacy in the external word, as written down in the inspired books, to heal, illuminate, and regenerate the minds of men. This efficacy he ascribed to the *internal word*, which he said was *Christ* himself. But of this internal word, he expresses himself in his usual manner, without uniformity and clearness; so that it is not easy to decide, whether he held the same views with the Mystics and the Quakers, or differed from them. (III.) In regard to the human nature of *Christ:* it displeased him to hear the human nature of Christ denominated a *creature* or created existence, in what theologians call its state of exaltation: for this language, he thought, below the dignity and majesty of Christ's human nature, since it had become united with the divine nature in one person. This opinion appeared to resemble what is called the Eutychian doctrine. But *Schwenckfeld* would not be considered a Eutychian; and on the contrary, accused those of Nestorianism, who called the human nature of *Christ* a *creature*.(27)

§ 25. As *Luther* taught, that the *gospel* or the doctrine of a salvation procured for mankind by *Jesus Christ*, should be inculcated on the people, and censured and chastised the papists for confounding the law and the gospel, and, for promising men salvation by obedience to the law; *John Agricola*, a native of Eisleben and a celebrated divine of the Lutheran church, though an ostentatious and fickle man, thence took occasion in the year 1538, to teach that the law should be wholly excluded from the church, and never be taught to the people; and that the gospel alone should be taught, both in the schools and from the pulpit. Those who agreed in this with *Agricola*, were called *Antinomians* or *enemies of the law*. But this sect also was suppressed in its very origin, by the energy and the influence of *Luther:* and *Agricola*, through fear of so great a man, confessed and renounced his error. It is said however, that the lion whom he dreaded, or *Luther*, being dead, he returned to the opinion he had renounced, and drew some persons to embrace it.(28)

sania, ut administratio *sacræ cœnæ* aliquandiu *plane intermissa, pædobaptismus* quoque *penitus prope fuerit exterminatus.—Tr.*]

(27) [Likewise in respect to the church, he held singular opinions. He regarded it as a visible community of believers only; and therefore held, that no hypocrite should be tolerated in the Christian church; that an absolute purity, not only of the church generally or as a body, but also of all the individual members of it, was possible; and he therefore wished to restore the ancient church discipline, in all its rigour. He likewise taught, that all the ministrations of unconverted preachers, were inefficient; and that the whole efficacy of the sacred ministry, depended on the gracious state of the preachers, or on the Spirit and internal word of God residing in them. On the whole, *Schwenckfeld* possessed too little true philosophy, to state correc ly and to substantiate his own views; and too little acquaintance with their original languages, to expound the scriptures correctly. He first learned Greek from *Crautwald.—Schl.*]

(28) See *Caspar Sagittarius*, Introductio ad historiam ecclesiast., tom. i., p. 838, &c. *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire, art Islebiens, tom. ii., p. 1567, [and art. *Agricola*, tome i., p. 100]. *Conrad Schlüsselburg*, Catalogus Hæreticor., lib. iv. *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, book xvi., ch. xxv., p. 813, &c. [By the writers of those times, he is generally called *Master Eisleben*. He was a pupil of *Luther;* and in 1530, when the Augsburg confession was presented, he aided Luther in defending it. His character was not the best. He was a restless, fiery, contentious man, negligent in duty, and more of a courtier than was becoming in a minister. He was a rector and preacher; and after his dismission, read lectures at Wittemberg. Perhaps, rivalship between the two colleagues, *Melancthon* and *Agricola*, and the desire of the latter to obtain the pre-eminence, rather than honest zeal for rescuing the truth from perversion, occasioned this contest. *Agricola* thought, that *Melancthon* in the articles which he drew up for visitation of the churches, had deviated from the sentiments of *Luther* and other reformers; that he held the use of the law un-

§ 26. The opinions of the *Antinomians* were most pernicious, if we may believe their adversaries. For they are said to have taught, that a person may live as he lists, and break the law by sinning at his pleasure, provided he holds to Christ, and has faith in his merits. But if we consider the whole subject with candour, we may readily believe, that *Agricola* did not teach such impious and absurd doctrines, though he might sometimes utter harsh expressions which were liable to misinterpretation and perversion. By the law, *Agricola* understood the ten commandments of Moses; which he supposed were a law enacted especially for the Jews, and not for Christians. The term gospel he used in a broad sense, as including not only the doctrine of Christ's merits, and of salvation by faith, but likewise all that Christ and his apostles inculcated respecting holiness of life and the duties of men. Removing therefore the unsuitable modes of expression and the integuments of his doctrine, he seems to have held merely this; that the ten commandments of Moses were promulged especially for the Jews, and of course might be neglected and laid aside among Christians; and that it would be sufficient to explain distinctly and to inculcate on the people, what Christ and his disciples had taught us in the books of the New Testament, respecting both the way of salvation, and repentance and a holy life. Most of the doctors of that age express their views with little precision and uniformity, and do not give us accurate definitions; and hence it often happens, that they are understood by others, differently from their real meaning.

§ 27. On the death of *Luther* in 1546, *Philip Melancthon* became the head and leader of the theologians of the Lutheran church. He was undoubtedly a great and excellent man, but much inferior to Luther in many respects,(29) especially in strength of mind, fortitude, and influence over others. For he was mild and gentle, excessively fond of peace and tranquillity, timid and shrinking before the resentment or wrath of the powerful; in short, one that could secure the attachment and love of others, but who was not competent to terrify, to repress and hold in awe the authors of disturbance and of new opinions. He also dissented from *Luther* on some subjects. For (I.) he thought that for the sake of peace, many things might be given up and be borne with, in the Romish church, which *Luther* thought could by no means be endured; indeed he did not hesitate to admit, that the ancient form of church government and even the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, might be retained, on certain conditions, and

der the N. Test. to be indispensable for conversion; and he wrote some propositions in opposition, which are printed in *Luther's* Works, (ed. Altenb., vol. vii., p. 310), and bear the title: Positiones inter fratres sparsæ. *Luther* confuted them, in six discussions; and *Agricola* was now held to retract; which he did at Wittemberg. But on leaving Wittemberg in 1540, and retiring to Berlin, where he possessed the good will of the electoral prince in a high degree and was employed in furthering the reformation, he did not cease occasionally to advance his propositions. Upon occasion of the Interim, he fell into the opposite error of the meritorious nature of good works. Among his adherents, *James Schenk*, superintendent at Freyberg in Meissen, was the most famous. He was dismissed in 1538, on account of his Antinomian opinions, when, appearing to retract, he was called to Leipsic: but again bringing them forward, he was dismissed the second time. See also *Jo. Geo. Walch's* Einleitung in die Streitigkeiten der Evangelischluth. Kirche, ch. ii., § x., p. 115.—*Schl.*]

(29) ["It would certainly be very difficult to point out the *many respects*, in which *Dr. Mosheim* affirms that Luther was superior to *Melancthon*. For if the single article of courage and firmness be excepted, I know no other respect in which *Melancthon* is not superior, or at least equal, to *Luther*. He was certainly his equal in piety and virtue, and much his superior in learning, judgment, meekness, and humanity."—*Macl.*]

provided the truth as clearly taught in the holy scriptures might be maintained. (II.) He supposed that certain opinions maintained by *Luther* against the papists,—for instance, concerning faith as the *sole* ground of justification, the necessity of good works in order to salvation, and the inability of man to convert himself to God,—might be softened down a little, so as not to give occasion to others to mistake. (III.) Though he believed with *Luther* in regard to the Lord's supper, yet he thought the controversy with the Swiss on that subject, was not of such moment that the parties could not maintain brotherly affection; that it would be a sufficient provision for peace and concord, if the doctrine in regard to the Lord's supper were stated in ambiguous terms and phrases, on which each party could put his own construction.—These opinions he did not indeed wholly dissemble and conceal during *Luther's* lifetime, but he proposed them with modesty, and always succumbed to *Luther*, whom he honoured and feared. But when *Luther* was dead, all that he had before taught cautiously and timidly, he now brought forward much more openly and explicitly. And all these things caused the Lutheran church, while he stood at the head of her theologians, to lose that peace which had been enjoyed under *Luther*, and to become in some measure the scene of many and fierce contests and commotions.

§ 28. The commencement of these calamities was in the year 1548, when *Maurice* the new elector of Saxony, directed *Melancthon* and the divines of Wittemberg and Leipsic to assemble at Leipsic, and to consider how far the noted *Interim* which *Charles* V. would obtrude upon Germany, might be received. *Melancthon*, partly through fear of the emperor and partly from his native mildness and moderation, here decided with the concurrence of the other divines, that in things *indifferent* (in rebus *adiaphoris*), the will of the emperor might be obeyed.(30) Among things *indifferent* or *adiaphora*, *Melancthon* and his associates reckoned many things, which *Luther* deemed of great importance, and which therefore his genuine followers could not account indifferent; for instance, the doctrine of justification before God by faith *alone*, the necessity of good works in order to salvation, the number of the sacraments, several ceremonies contaminated with superstition, extreme unction, the dominion of the Roman pontiff and of bishops, certain feast days long abrogated, and other things. Hence arose the violent contest, called the *Adiaphoristic controversy*;(31) which was protracted many years, and in which the defenders and advocates of

(30) The paper containing the opinion of *Melancthon* and the other divines respecting things indifferent, or *the result* of their deliberations, is commonly called *The Leipsic Interim* (*Das Leipziger Interim*); and was republished by *Jo. Erdm. Bieck*, in his work entitled Das dreyfache Interim, Leipsic, 1721, 8vo. [This *Interim* is properly an appendage to the result of the diet of Leipsic, Dec. 22, 1548. In it the theologians define what they regard as *indifferent* liturgical matters, which might be admitted, to please the emperor and at his command. Among them were the papal dresses for priests, the apparel used at mass, the surplice; and many customs evidently indicative of worship paid to the host, such as tolling and ringing bells at the elevation of the host. Besides *Melancthon*, there were present at this diet, *Paul Eber*. *Bugenhagen*, and *George Major* of the Wittemberg divines, and *Pfeffinger* of Leipsic; likewise the bishop of Merseberg, prince *George* of Anhalt, and *Justus Menius*. This *Leipsic Interim* must be distinguished from that of Augsburg, and from the still older one of Regenspurg, of both which, notice has already been taken.—*Schl.*]

(31) [*Adiaphoristic*, from ἀδιάφορος, *indifferent*. Melancthon, and those who thought with him, were called *Adiaphorists*.—*Tr.*]

the old doctrines of *Luther*, (at the head of whom was *Matthias Flacius* of Illyricum), opposed with immense fervour the Wittemberg and Leipsic divines, especially *Melancthon*, by whose council and influence the whole had been brought about; and accused them of apostacy from the true religion. On the other hand, *Melancthon* and his disciples and friends, defended his conduct with all their strength.(32) In this sad and perilous controversy, there were two principal points at issue. *First:* whether the things that *Melancthon* deemed *indifferent*, actually were so; which his adversaries denied. *Secondly:* whether it is lawful, in things indifferent and not essential to religion, to succumb to the enemies of truth.

§ 29. This *adiaphoristic* controversy was the fruitful parent of other and equally pernicious contests. In the first place, it produced the contest with *George Major*, a divine of Wittemberg, respecting the necessity of good works to salvation. *Melancthon* had long been accustomed to concede, and in the consultation at Leipsic in 1548 respecting the *Interim*, he with his associates confessed, that it might be said without prejudice to the truth, that *good works are necessary to salvation.* But as the defenders of the old Lutheran theology censured this declaration, as being contrary to the doctrine of *Luther* and highly useful to the popish cause; *Major* in the

(32) *Conrad Schlüsselburg*, Catalogus Hæreticorum, lib. xiii. *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, book xvi., ch. xxvi., p. 816. *Chr. Aug. Salig's* Historie der Augsburgischen Confession, vol. i., p. 611, &c. Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1702, p. 339, 393. *Lucas Osiander*, Epitome Historiæ Eccles., cent. xvi., p. 502, &c. [From the records of these contests, (many of which are given by *Schlüsselburg* especially), it appears that, besides the points already mentioned, they contended about the use of Latin formulas of worship, and about chanting them; whether the prayers in public worship and particularly at the celebration of the Lord's supper, should be read, or be sung; respecting the observance of various times of worship, as vespers, matins, the canonical hours, and the days devoted to *St. Mary* and the Apostles. The most of these, though previously abolished, had already been again introduced in electoral Saxony and Brandenburg, by prince *Maurice*, in order to please *Charles* V., and likewise in most of the imperial cities; among which Nuremberg stood prominent, because there most of the preachers were Philippists.—*Schl.* The representations of *Dr. Mosheim* in the text, would seem to imply, what was by no means the fact, that *Melancthon* rejected the doctrine of justification by faith *alone*, held to salvation by works, and admitted seven sacraments, &c. *Schlegel's* representations, on the contrary, would seem to imply, that *Melancthon* only conceded the lawfulness of yielding to the imposition of certain *ceremonies* and *forms* of worship. According to *Schroeckh*, (Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, vol. iv., p. 690, &c.), the Augsburg *Interim*, which the emperor would force upon his subjects, contained nearly the whole system of the Romish theology, both as to faith and practice; yet expressed throughout in the most accommodating and unexceptionable language. *Melancthon*, and the other divines, endeavoured so to modify this *Interim*, that the Protestants might conscientiously yield to it, under the existing circumstances. They therefore altered and interpolated the doctrinal articles, and sifted and modified those relating to worship and ceremonies. They allowed the pope to remain at the head of the church; but without conceding to him a divine right, and without allowing him to be the arbiter of faith. The seven sacraments were permitted to remain, as religious rites; but not under the denomination of sacraments, nor as efficacious to salvation, in the popish sense. The mass was represented, as merely a repetition of the Lord's supper. Good works were allowed to be necessary to salvation; yet not as the meritorious ground of justification, but only as an essential part of the Christian character. Salvation was wholly by grace, through faith in the merits of Christ. Thus they supposed, they secured all the essential articles of religion, and only consented to be saddled with a load of cumbersome and injudicious ceremonies, rather than incur the vengeance of the emperor, and expose the whole reformation to danger. *Melancthon's* actual belief is to be learned from his *Loci Communes*, or System of theology; no *essential* part of which, as he supposed, was given up in the Leipsic interim.—*Tr.*]

year 1552, defended it against *Nicholas Amsdorf*, in a tract expressly on the subject of the necessity of good works. And now broke out again a fierce and bitter contest, such as all the religious controversies of that age were, between the more rigid Lutherans and the more lax. And in the course of it, *Nicholas Amsdorf*, a strenuous vindicator of *Luther's* doctrines, was carried so far by the heat of controversy, as to maintain that good works are *pernicious* to salvation: which imprudent admission furnished fresh matter for controversy. *Major* bitterly complained that his opinion was misrepresented by his opponents; and at last, that he might not appear to continue the war and disturb the church unreasonably, he gave it up. Yet the dispute was continued, and was terminated only by the *Form of Concord*.(33)

§ 30. From the same source arose what is called the *synergistic*(34) controversy. The *Synergists* were nearly the same as the Semipelagians; i. e., they were persons who supposed, that God is not the *sole* author of our conversion to him, but that man *co-operates* with God in the renovation of his own mind. On this subject also *Melancthon* differed, at least in words, from *Luther;* and in the Leipsic conference, he did not hesitate to say, that *God so draws and converts adults, that some agency of their wills accompanies his influences.* The pupils and friends of *Melancthon* adopted his language. But the strenuous Lutherans conceived, that this sentiment contravened and subverted *Luther's* doctrine of the *servitude* of the will, or of man's impotence to regenerate himself and to perform any good actions; and they therefore violently assailed the persons whom they denominated *Synergists.* In this contest, the principal champions were *Victorinus Strigel*, who the most openly and ingeniously defended the Melancthonian doctrine, and *Matthias Flacius*, who defended the old opinion of Luther. Of these men we shall give account shortly.(35)

§ 31. In the midst of these tumults and commotions, the dukes of Saxe-Weimar (the sons of that *John Frederic* whose unsuccessful war with *Charles* V. brought on him so many evils and the loss of his electoral dig-

(33) *Schlüsselburg*, Catalog. Hæreticor., lib. vii. *Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, book xvi., chap. xxvii., p. 822, &c. *Jo. Musæus*, Prælect. in Form. Concord., p. 181, &c. *Arn. Grevius*, Memoria Jo. Westphali, p. 166, &c. [*Schlegel* here inserts a long note, showing that neither *Melancthon* nor *Major* held to justification on the ground of merit, or of good works, though they held good works to be necessary, in some sense, to a man's salvation. It seems, the parties misunderstood each other; and that both used very unguarded language, which led them into furious conflicts, for which there was no sufficient cause.—*Tr.*]

(34) [From *συνέργεια*, *co-operation.*—*Tr.*]

(35) See *Schlüsselburg*, Catalogus Hæreticor, lib. v. *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, b. xvi., ch. xxviii., p. 826, &c. *Bayle*, Dictionnaire, art. Synergistes, tome iii., p. 2898. *Christ. Aug. Salig*, Historie der Augsb. Confession, vol. iii., p. 474, 587, 880, &c. *Musæus*, Prælect. in Formam Concord., p. 88. [*Melancthon* in his first writings, as well as *Luther* at first, maintained with *St. Augustine*, an irresistible operation of divine grace, according to God's unconditional decrees; and he so taught in the first edition of his Loci Communes. But afterwards, in the third and eighteenth articles of the altered Augsburg confession, he taught that for our conversion, we need only the *assistance* of God and his spirit; and that though weak and hard pressed, we can ourselves commence it and effect it. In his Examen Ordinandorum he maintains, that there are *three* causes of conversion, God, the word of God, and free-will; and he seems to ascribe to free-will and to human ability, an appropriate natural power, though feeble in its operation, to bring about conversion. Many of his pupils hereupon went still farther; and especially *Victorin Strigel*, one of his most able pupils, distinguished himself in this controversy.—*Schl.*]

nity), founded and opened a new university at Jena. And as the founders wished this school to be the seat of the true reformed religion of *Luther*, they called to it eminent teachers and theologians, who were distinguished for their attachment to the genuine theology of Luther, and for their hatred of all more moderate sentiments. And as none was more celebrated in this respect than *Matthias Flacius*, a most strenuous adversary of *Philip Melancthon* and of all the Philippists or moderate party, he was made professor of theology at Jena, in the year 1557. But this turbulent man, whom nature had fitted to sow discord and to promote contention, not only cherished all the old controversies with vast zeal, but likewise stirred up new ones, and so involved the divines of Weimar and those of electoral Saxony with each other, that the discerning were afraid of a permanent secession and schism among the Lutherans.(36) And undoubtedly the Lutheran church would have been split into two communities, if his councils had had the effect intended. For in the year 1559, he advised his lords, the dukes of Weimar, to order a *confutation* of all the errors that had been broached among the Lutherans, and especially of those with which the Melancthonians were taxed, to be drawn up, published, and annexed to the formulas of faith in their territories. But this attempt to rend the Lutheran church into opposing parties, proved abortive, because the other princes who were truly Lutheran, disapproved the book, and feared it would be the cause of greater evils.(37)

§ 32. This extremely contentious man threw the Weimarian church, and the university of Jena of which he was a professor, into commotion, by his attacks upon *Victorin Strigel*, his colleague, who was a pupil and friend of *Melancthon*.(38) *Strigel* taught in many points, according to the prescriptions of *Melancthon;* and especially, he denied that the human mind is altogether inactive, while God moves and draws it to repentance. *Flacius* therefore so successfully accused him of *synergism* before the court of Weimar, that *Strigel* was put into close custody by order of the prince. From this calamity he delivered himself in 1562, by publishing an exposition of his views; and he was restored to liberty and to his office. Yet the contest did not subside here; because it was thought, that he concealed his errors under ambiguous expressions, rather than discarded them.

(36) See the memorable epistle of *Augustus*, the prince elector, respecting *Flacius* and his attempts; published by *Arn. Grevius*, Memoria Joh. Westphali, p. 393, &c.

(37) See *Chr. Aug. Salig's* Historie der Augsb. Confession, vol. iii., p. 476, &c. [A *confutation* was actually drawn up by *Strigel*, *Erhard Schnepf*, and a preacher of Jena. When it was ready, the theologians of Jena and the superintendents of the whole land were called to Weimar, to examine it. *Flacius* advised, that the writers of it should not be admitted into the assembly, urging that the theologians would then express their opinions more freely, and that the presence of the writers, whose opinions might easily be known from the book itself, might occasion controversy and disunion. But the duke would not follow this advice, and the writers were called to the council. There was now a continued scene of altercation; for *Flacius* and others found much to censure in the confutation, and the writers of it would not allow it to be altered. The superintendents next collected together various confutations, out of which an abstract was afterwards made, which being amended by *Flacius*, *Erasmus Sarcarius*, *Joachim Mörlin*, and *John Aurifaber*, was printed in 1559, with an edict of the duke, and was afterwards admitted into the Corpus doctrinæ Thuringicum: but *Strigel*, from the first, strenuously opposed this form of a confutation. See Narratio Action. et certam Matth. Flacii, in *Schlüsselburg's* Catal. Hæreticor., tom. xiii., p. 802, &c.—*Schl.*]

(38) See the biographers of *Strigel;* and, besides the others above mentioned, *Bayle*, in his Dictionnaire, tom. iii., p. 1262.

Therefore, to escape being involved in new troubles, he retired from Jena first to Leipsic and then to Heidelberg; where he died, leaving posterity in doubt, whether he ought to be classed among the true followers of *Luther* or not.

§ 33. But *Flacius* blew up this controversy with *Strigel* greatly to his own injury, and likewise to the great injury of the whole Lutheran church. For while pursuing his adversary intemperately, he fell himself into a sentiment so monstrous and wrong, that his own friends regarded him as a *heretic* and a corrupter of true religion. In the year 1560, there was a formal dispute between him and *Strigel* at Weimar, respecting the natural power of man to regenerate himself and to do good, which *Strigel* seemed to exalt too much. In this conference, *Strigel* who was well skilled in philosophy, with a view to cramp *Flacius*, asked him whether original sin or the vitiosity of the human soul, was to be classed among *substances* or among *accidents?* *Flacius* most imprudently replied, that it should be reckoned among *substances;* and thenceforth to the end of his life, he maintained the portentous sentiment, that *original sin is the very substance of a man;* and with so much zeal and pertinacity, that he would sooner part with all his honours and privileges than with this error. The greatest part of the Lutheran church condemned this Flacian doctrine, and judged it to be nearly allied to Manichæism. But the high rank of the man, his learning, and his reputation, induced many, and even some very learned men, to embrace and eagerly defend his cause; among whom, *Cyriac Spangenberg*, *Christopher Irenæus*, and *Cælestine* were the most celebrated.(39)

§ 34. It is almost impossible to express, how much this new contest afflicted those Lutheran countries in which it raged, and how much detriment it brought to the Lutheran cause among the papists. For it spread also to the churches that had a dubious toleration in papal lands, especially in the Austrian dominions; and it so excited the teachers who were surrounded by papists, that they were regardless of all prudence and all danger.(40) There are many who think, that *Flacius* fell into this error through ignorance of philosophical distinctions and ideas, and that he failed more in propriety of language than in point of fact. But *Flacius* himself seems to refute this; for in numerous passages, he declares that he understood well the force of the word *substance*, and that he was not ignorant of the consequences of his doctrine.(41) Be this as it may, it is beyond all doubt that unbridled obstinacy was in the man, who would rather ruin his own fortune and disturb the peace of the church, than discard an unsuitable term and a sentiment made up of contradictions.

§ 35. Finally, the well-known mildness of Melancthon, which *Andrew*

(39) See *Conrad Schlüsselburg's* Catologus Hæreticor., lib. ii. *Jo. Balth. Ritter's* Life of Flacius, in German, Frankf., 1725, 8vo. *Christ. Aug. Salig's* Historie der Augsb. Confess., vol. iii., p. 593. *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, b. xvi., ch. xxix., p. 829. *Jo. Musæus*, Prælection. in Formulam Concord., p. 29, &c. *Jo. Geo. Leuckfeld's* History of Spangenberg, in German, 1728, 4to. On the dispute at Weimar, see Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1740, p. 383, &c.

(40) *Bernh. Raupach's* zwiefache Zugabe zu dem Evangelisch. Œsterreich, p. 25, 29, 32, 34, 43, 64, who treats of the Austrian Flacians, and particularly of *Irenæus;* Presbyterol. Austriacæ, p. 69, &c. Respecting *Cælestine*, see Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1748, p. 314, &c.

(41) See the Letters of *Jo. Westphal*, (a friend of *Flacius*, and who endeavoured to persuade him to give up the term *substance*), addressed to *Flacius*, and the answers of *Flacius;* published by *Arnold Grevius*, in his Memoria Joh. Westphali, p. 186, &c.

Osiander contemned, gave rise to those contests which the latter in 1549, excited in the Lutheran church. For if *Luther* had been alive, *Osiander* would doubtless have not dared to bring forward and defend his new opinions. This arrogant and eccentric man, after removing from Nuremberg where he had been a pastor to the university of Konigsberg, on account of the *Interim*, first publicly taught opinions very different from *Luther's* respecting penitence and the divine image; and afterwards, from the year 1550, he did not hesitate to correct the public opinion of the Lutheran church, respecting the mode of our obtaining justification before God. Yet it is easier to tell what he did *not* believe, than what he did believe; for according to the custom of the age, *Osiander* expressed his views neither with clearness nor in a uniform manner. Comparing all that he has said, it seems to have been his opinion: That the man Christ Jesus could not, by his obedience to the divine law, have merited for us righteousness before God. And therefore it cannot be, that we can become righteous before God, by apprehending with faith and applying to ourselves *this* righteousness of the man Christ Jesus. But a man obtains righteousness, by that eternal and *essential* righteousness which resides in Christ as God or in that *divine nature* which was united to the human. And of this divine righteousness, a man becomes partaker by faith. For by faith Christ *dwells* in the man, and together with Christ also his divine nature: and this righteousness being present in the regenerate, God on account of it regards them as righteous, although they are sinners. The same divine righteousness of Christ moreover, excites believers to cultivate personal righteousness or holiness. The principal theologians of the Lutheran church, and among them *Melancthon* especially, and his colleagues, impugned this doctrine. Yet *Osiander* had also great men to support his cause. But after his death, [A.D. 1552], the controversy gradually subsided.(42)

(42) See *Conrad Schlüsselburg's* Catalogus Hæreticor., lib. vi. *Arnold's* Kirchen- und Ketzerhist., b. xvi., ch. xxiv., p. 804, &c. *Christ. Hartknoch's* Preussische Kirchenhistorie, book ii., ch. ii., p. 309, &c. *Chr. Aug. Salig's* Historie der Augsb. Confession, vol. ii., p. 922. The opinion of the divines of Wittemberg respecting this controversy, may be seen in the Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1739, p. 141, &c., and that of the divines of Copenhagen, in the Dänischen Bibliothek, pt. vii., p. 150, &c., where is a long catalogue of the writers on this controversy. Add pt. viii., p. 313, &c. On the arrogance of *Osiander*, see *Hirsch's* Nüremberg. Interims-Historie, p. 44, 59, 60, &c. [*Andrew Osiander*, or *Hosemann* as his name was in German, was born at Sunzenhausen in Franconia, 1498; studied at Leipsic and Altenburg under great poverty, and then at Ingolstadt. He possessed superior native talents, and became very learned, particularly in Hebrew, mathematics, and theology. He was eloquent, yet proud, self-sufficient, and contentious. In 1522. he became first preacher in a church at Nuremberg; and was there very active, and highly respected, notwithstanding he advanced some singular opinions. He supposed, the second person in the trinity was that image of God, after which man was fashioned; that the Son of God would have become incarnate, if man had not sinned; and that repentance consisted in abhorrence of sin and forsaking it, without including faith in the Gospel. He also refused to pronounce the general absolution in public worship; which involved him in controversy. While at Nuremberg he wrote his famous Harmony of the Gospels. The margrave *Albrecht* of Brandenburg had been converted by his preaching, and therefore became strongly attached to him. Having founded the university of Konigsberg in 1544, *Albrecht* placed *Osiander* at the head of the theological department in 1548. His colleagues disliked having a foreigner placed above them; and his bold avowal of singular opinions soon gave them occasion to break with him. He considered the *justification* spoken of in the N. Testament, to be equivalent to *sanctification*; or to be, not a forensic act of God acquitting men from liability to punishment, but a gracious operation, which conferred personal holiness. And

§ 36. His colleague *Francis Stancarus*, an Italian, and professor of Hebrew at Konigsberg, a turbulent and passionate man, in attempting to confute the error of *Osiander* respecting the mode of obtaining justification before God, fell into another opinion which appeared equally false and dangerous. *Osiander* maintained, that the *man* Christ was under obligation to keep the divine law, on his own account; and therefore that he could not, by obeying the law, procure righteousness for others; and of course, it was not as man, but only as God, that Christ expiated the sins of mankind and procured us peace with God. *Stancarus* on the contrary, excluded the divine nature of Christ from the work of redemption and atonement, and maintained that the office of a mediator between God and men, pertained exclusively to the human nature of Christ. Finding himself to be odious on account of this doctrine, he left Konigsberg, and retired first to Germany and then to Poland, where he died in 1574. He likewise excited considerable commotion in Poland.(43)

§ 37. All good men friendly to the new church, were the more desirous of a termination of so many bitter contests, because it was manifest that the papists turned them to their own advantage. But while *Melancthon*, the principal cause of the disputes, continued alive, nothing scarcely could be done to terminate them. But when he died in 1560, something could be attempted with more safety and better prospects. Therefore after other efforts, *Augustus* prince elector of Saxony and *John William* duke of Weimar, in the year 1568, ordered the best theologians of both parties to assemble at Altenburg, and there discuss in a friendly manner their principal controversies; so that it might better appear, in what way they could be settled. But the warmth of the disputants, and other causes, prevented any good effects from this conference.(44) It was therefore thought best, to try some other method of restoring harmony; and it was resolved,

in this sense he used the term, in his theological writings. Legal justification through the imputed righteousness of Christ, he would denominate *redemption;* and this he supposed always preceded what he called justification. The *mode* of justification, in his sense of the term, he supposed to be, by the *indwelling of Christ* in the soul, producing there a moral change. See *Arnold*, l. c., and *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reformat., vol. iv., p. 572, &c.—*Tr.*]

(43) See *Chr. Hartknoch's* Preussische Kirchengeschichte, b. ii., ch. ii., p. 340, &c. *Schlüsselburg's* Catalogus Hæreticor., lib. ix., the whole of it. *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire, art. *Stancarus*, tome iii., p. 2649, &c. Before he came to Konigsberg in 1548, he lived a while among the Grisons and the Swiss; and among them he occasioned disputes; for he approved several Lutheran sentiments, particularly those respecting the efficacy of the sacraments, which were offensive to the Grisons and the Swiss. See Museum Helveticum, tom. v., p. 484, 490, 491, [and *De Porta's* Historia Reformat. ecclesiar. Hæticar., lib. ii., p. 89, 121.—*Tr.*] On the commotions he excited in Poland in 1556, see *Bullinger*, in *Jo. Conr. Fueslin's* Centuria i. Epistolar. a Reformator. Helvet. Scriptarum, p. 371, 459, &c. [*Stancarus* is said to have contributed to the spread of Socinian sentiments in Poland; by maintaining that it was only the human nature of Christ that made the atonement, and by arguing, that if the divine nature of Christ mediated between God and man, then his divine nature must have been inferior to that of God. From the first, the Socinians inferred that there was no need of any nature but the human in the Mediator; and from the second, they inferred that he could not at any rate be equal with God the Father. See *Bayle*, l. c., note G.—*Tr.*]

(44) See *Casp. Sagittarius*, Introductio ad Histor. Ecclesiast., pt. ii., p. 1542. [The subjects discussed were, the Majoristic, Synergistic, and Adiaphoristic contests. The debaters were in part Misnian, and in part Thuringian divines. As all the transactions were in writing, the conferences were protracted to a great length; and on one single expression in the article on justification, the discussion lasted five months.—*Schl.*]

that a *formula* or book should be drawn up by wise and moderate theologians, in which all those controversies should be examined and decided; and that this book, when approved by all the Lutheran princes and churches, should be annexed to the Symbolical books of the Lutheran church. To this great and difficult work, *James Andreæ*, a theologian of Tubingen at that time in very high estimation, was appointed in the year 1569, by authority of his prince the duke of Würtemberg, and of *Julius* duke of Brunswick. With these princes, *Augustus* of Saxony and other princes of the Lutheran communion, concurred: and supported by such authority, *Andreæ* repeatedly travelled over Germany, and consulted with the ministers of the courts and with theologians, respecting the best method of drawing up the *formula* so that it might secure the assent of all.

§ 38. This business was hastened forward by the rash temerity of *Casper Peucer*, the son-in-law of *Melancthon*, a physician and professor of physic at Wittemberg,(45) and by others, theologians at Wittemberg and at Leipsic, who were pupils of *Melancthon:* for they, relying on the approbation and countenance of *George Cracovius*, the chancellor of Dresden, and of others in the Saxon court both civilians and clergymen, endeavoured by various clandestine arts, in the year 1570, to abolish throughout Saxony the doctrine of *Luther* concerning the holy supper, and to introduce in its stead the opinion of *Calvin* respecting both the Lord's Supper and the person of Christ. What *Melancthon's* final sentiments concerning the eucharist were, appears uncertain;(46) though it is abundantly proved, that he would willingly have united the Saxons and the Calvinists, but was prevented by his timidity from directly attempting such a union. His son-in-law, with his associates above named, openly assented to [the doctrines of] *Calvin*, as appears from their writings; and thus they showed more courage and resolution than their father-in-law and preceptor, but less of prudence. Therefore in the year 1571, in a German book entitled *The Foundation* (*die Grundfeste*), and afterwards by other writings, they explicitly declared their dissent [from *Luther*] respecting the doctrine of the sacred supper and the person of Christ: and the more readily to accomplish their wishes, they introduced into the schools a new *Catechism* drawn up by *Pezel*, favourable to the doctrine of *Calvin*. These measures having produced commotions and disputes in the Lutheran church, *Augustus* of Saxony ordered his theologians and superintendents to assemble at Dresden in

(45) ["This *Peucer*, whom *Dr. Mosheim* mentions without any mark of distinction, was one of the wisest, most amiable, and most learned men that adorned the annals of German literature during this century, as the well-known history of his life, and the considerable number of his medical, mathematical, moral, and theological writings, abundantly testify."—*Macl.*]

(46) [This is certain, that in his last years, *Melancthon* was more inclined towards the doctrine of the Reformed respecting the holy supper: but it is also equally certain, that he did not receive their whole doctrine on this subject. See his Reflections, in Latin, published by *Pezel*, Neustadt, 1600, 8vo. Here he writes, one year before his death, in a letter to *Dr. Jo. Crato*, p. 385, concerning the supper: Verum est, filium Deum adesse mysterio et in eo efficacem esse, καὶ τὸν ἄρτον κοινωνίαν εἶναι τῆ σώματος, ut Paulus diserte locutus est. Scio enim, te virum doctum recte cogitare, quid κοινωνία significet. Hæc nunc breviter scripsi, *nec volo spargi in populum*. And in p. 390, writing to *Abraham Hardenberg*, he cites a passage from *Macarius'* Homilies, which he thus translates: In ecclesia offertur panis et vinum *antitypon* carnis et sanguinis ipsius: et accipientes de pane visibili *spiritualiter* comedunt carnem Domini. And he subjoins: Scio te libenter tam vetus testimonium lecturum. This letter is dated Feb. 9, 1560. See also *Löscher's* Historia Motuum, vol. ii., p. 30, and especially, p. 39, &c.—*Schl.*]

1571, and declare their sentiments respecting the sacred supper. They did so; but deceitfully: and returning home, they zealously pursued the plan they had formed, and by teaching and writing, and in other ways, endeavoured to extinguish the old Saxon doctrine concerning the sacred supper. The prince elector *Augustus*, when fully informed of this by numerous witnesses, summoned the celebrated convention of Torgau, in 1574; and having clearly learned the views of those *Crypto-Calvinists* as they were generally called, imprisoned some of them, banished others, and compelled others to change their sentiments. On none of them did he animadvert with greater severity, than on *Peucer*, who had acted a leading part in the transaction. He was kept in constant and close prison, till the year 1585; and then, being liberated at the intercession of the prince of Anhalt, whose daughter Augustus had married, he retired to Zerbst.(47)

§ 39. The plans of the *Crypto-Calvinists* being frustrated, the prince elector, and those who agreed with him, urged forward more anxiously and pressingly the business of the *Formula of Concord* already mentioned. [See § 37.] After various consultations therefore, in the year 1576, *James Andreæ* especially, in a convention of many divines assembled at Torgau by order of *Augustus*, drew up the treatise which was intended to give peace to the Lutheran church and to guard it against the opinions of the

(47) See *Conr. Schlüsselburg's* Calvinistic Theology, in German, book ii., p. 207, b. iii., Pref., and p. 1–22, 52, 57, 69, b. iv., p. 246, &c. *Leonh. Hutter's* Concordia Concors, cap. i.–viii. *Godf. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhist., book xvi., ch. xxxii., p. 389–395. *Val. Ern. Löscher's* Historia motuum inter Lutheranos et Reform., pt. ii., p. 176, pt. iii., p. 1, &c. Add, on the other side, *Casper Peucer's* Historia carcerum et liberationis divinæ; published by *Christ. Pezel*, Tiguri, 1605, 8vo. [Likewise, *Jo. Rudolph Kiesling's* Continuation of the Historia motuum, Schwabach, 1770, ch. i., § 9, 10. The Catechism of *Pezel*, was printed at Wittemb., 1571, and entitled; Catechesis, continens explicationem Decalogi, Symboli, orationis dominicæ, doctrinæ de pœnitentia et sacramentis. The theologians of Jena and lower Saxony, wrote against this catechism. See *Walch's* Bibliotheca Theol. Selecta, tom. i., p. 485. The *Crypto-Calvinists* defended it the same year, in a treatise entitled: Grundfeste von der person und menschwerdung unseres herrn Jesu Christi, wider die neuen Marcioniten, Samosatener, &c. In reply, the divines of lower Saxony wrote: die wiederhohlte christliche gemeine Confession und Erklärung, &c. At the convention of Dresden, the Consensus Dresdensis was drawn up, through the intervention of the court party and especially of the court preacher *Schütze* or *Sagittarius*. It met with the greatest opposition from the foreign churches; and the houses of Brunswick, with the duke of Würtemberg, made strong representations against it to the prince elector. Upon this, in 1574, followed the Exegesis perspicua controversiæ de cœna Domini; in which indeed they sought to keep up an appearance of coincidence with our symbolical books; but very manifestly took pains to defend the Melancthonian doctrine concerning the holy supper. The electoral prince, prompted by so many complaints of foreign princes, who were apprehensive the religious peace might be assailed by the Catholics under the pretence of this contest, at last took measures to check the evil. He commanded certain articles to be drawn up, by the general adoption of which the religious contests might be terminated. These were actually formed in the diet of Torgau, 1574; and may be found in *Hutter's* Concordia concors, p. 184, &c. They were, however, by the foreign theologians to whom they were sent for examination, deemed insufficient to remove the contests. But mild as these first articles were, (and they must not be confounded with the articles of Torgau of 1576), yet many hesitated to subscribe to them; and many that did subscribe, afterwards revoked their subscription. And now resort was had to those harsh measures, which never can be justified; to imprisonments and banishments, and to the forcible introduction of certain theological statements which were opposed to the statements of the Philippists. For *Philippists* [or *Melancthonians*] is the proper appellation for these *Crypto-Calvinists;* since they for the most part, admitted the *real presence* in the eucharist, and questioned only the *omnipresence* of Christ's human nature.—*Schl.*]

Reformed, and which from the place received the name of the *Book of Torgau*. This book, after being examined, amended, and elucidated, by most of the theologians of Lutheran Germany, was again submitted to certain select divines assembled at Bergen, (an old Benedictine monastery near Magdeburg), and when all the suggestions from various quarters had been carefully weighed, the famous *Formula of Concord* was brought to its perfected state. *James Andreæ* had for assistants at Bergen, at first *Martin Chemnitz* and *Nicholas Selnecker*, and afterwards, also *Andrew Musculus*, *Christopher Cörner*, and *David Chytræus*. The Saxons first received this new rule of the Lutheran religion, by order of their prince *Augustus;* and the greatest part of the Lutheran churches afterwards followed their example, some sooner and some later.(48) The effect of this

(48) The writers on the formula of Concord, are mentioned by *Jo. Geo. Walch*, Introductio ad Libros Symbolicos, lib. i., c. vii., p. 707, and by *Jo. Christ. Köcher*, Bibliotheca theologiæ symbol., p. 188. A catalogue of unpublished documents relating to its history, is extant in den Unschuld. Nachricht. A.D. 1753, p. 322. The principal historians of it, are *Rudolph Hospinian* a Swiss theologian, Concordia Discors; and *Leonh. Hutter*, Concordia Concors: and by comparing the accounts of both, it will be easy to discriminate the true from the false, and to understand the reasons of what took place. [See *J. F. Balthasar's* Geschichte des Torgischen Buches nebst andern zur Historie des Concordiensbuches gehörigen Nachrichten, Greifsw., 1741, &c., 4to, and *Semler's* edition of the Book of Torgau, from a contemporary manuscript document, with a compendium of the most noticeable parts of that manuscript collection; 1760, 8vo. In tracing the history of the Formula of Concord, we should consider the preparatory events. These were (I.) The *Swabian Concord*, or Formula concordiæ inter Suevicas et Saxonicas ecclesias; which was formed in 1574. By the *Saxon* churches, must here be understood those of lower Saxony, and in particular the ecclesiæ Tripolitanæ, or the churches of Hamburg, Lubec, and Luneburg, whose preachers were strenuous Lutherans; together with the duchies of Brunswick and Luneburg, and the cities of Brunswick and Magdeburg. All these united with the Swabian and especially with the Würtemberg theologians, against those of electoral Saxony; and they sent their Formula to the prince elector of Saxony, in order to show him that his theologians had departed from the Lutheran doctrine, and that he could no longer be the chief director of the affairs of the Protestants. Then followed (II.) The *convention at Torgau*, in 1574. Next followed, by order of *Lewis* duke of Würtemberg, (III.) The *convention of Maulbronn*, in 1576; where the Würtemberg divines *Lucas Osiander* and *Balth. Bidenbach*, with the concurrence of some foreign divines, drew up what is called the *Formula of Maulbronn;* in which the orthodox ministers of our church state on what conditions they would unite with the divines of electoral Saxony, and recognise them as members of our church. Afterwards came (IV.) The *Lichtenberg convention*, in Feb., 1576, in electoral Saxony; at which the Formula of Maulbronn was examined, and pronounced too rigorous. Then followed (V.) The *convention of Torgau*, in June of the same year, after the suspected divines of electoral Saxony were removed. Here the Book of Torgau was compiled from the Swabian Concord and the Maulbronn Formula; and this was the real basis of that Formula of Concord, which was afterwards sent to all the German courts and churches to collect suggestions and amendments. After the suggestions of the foreign theologians were received, in the year 1577 and at the cloister of Bergen, the proper *Formula of Concord* was formed from the Book of Torgau. The principal person concerned in it, was *James Andreä*, who was occupied many years in the business, took a number of journeys and showed extraordinary zeal in the whole affair, yet incurred many reproaches, by the ambiguous expressions which he employed. And by his influence it was, that the opinions of the Swabian divines respecting the person of Christ, the communication of the attributes [of Christ's divine nature to his human] (communicatio idiomatum), and the omnipresence of Christ's human nature, which before had been only private opinions, were received into the Formula of Concord as doctrines of the whole Lutheran church. With him was joined *Nicholas Selnecker*, a native Frenchman of Herspruck, and at that time superintendent at Leipsic; a learned and persevering man, who had endured much persecution from the Philippists. The two others that were associated with *James Andreä*, were still more learned, and at the same time

celebrated *Formula*, as is well known, was, to decide and terminate the many controversies which had drawn the Lutherans especially after *Luther's* death, into disagreeing parties; and also, to exclude from the Lutheran community the opinions of the Reformed respecting the holy supper and the person of Christ.

§ 40. Yet the book, which was to have restored harmony among the Lutherans, and which actually did so in many places, furnished also new ground of discord. In the first place the Reformed, and those who either favoured the Reformed or at least wished to be at peace with them for the sake of the common good, when they perceived that by this Formula all hope of healing the schism was at an end, and that the Reformed were entirely excluded from all communion with the Lutherans, violently attacked and in bitter terms censured both the Formula and its authors. Beyond the bounds of Germany, the Swiss (of whom *Rudolph Hospinian* was the chief) and the Belgians;(49) and in Germany, those of the Palatinate,(50) of Anhalt, of Baden, and others, waged furious war upon the Formula. This imposed upon the Lutheran divines and especially upon those of Saxony, the disagreeable task of defending it and its framers in various treatises.(51)

§ 41. Even among the Lutherans themselves, some of the most distinguished churches could not be persuaded either by entreaties or arguments, to receive the *Formula* and to add it to their guides in doctrinal instruction. It was therefore rejected by the Hessians, the Pomeranians, the Nurembergers, the Holstenians, (through the influence of *Paul von Eitzen* the superintendent general), by the Silesians, the Danes, the Brunswickers or Julians, and others.(52) But all these were not influenced by the same

much disposed to peace, namely, *Martin Chemnitz* and *David Chytræus*, both pupils of Melancthon. The first was then superintendent at Brunswick, and had few equals in learning and facility in writing. He was a venerator of *Melancthon*, and endeavoured in many respects to find out a middle path, and to check the violence of *Andreä*. Hence, he and *Andreä* may be considered as the proper composers of the instrument. *Chytræus* was of Rostock. *Musculus* and *Cörner* were of Frankfort on the Oder, and were famed for their zeal for *Luther's* doctrines; yet these had no great concern with the Book of Torgau.—*Schl.*]

(49) *Peter Vilier's* Epistola Apologetica Reformatarum in Belgio ecclesiarum ad et contra auctores libri Bergensis dicti Concordiæ, with the notes of *Lew. Gerh. a Renesse;* republished by *Daniel Gerdes*, in his Scrinium Antiquarium, or Miscellaneæ Groningens. novæ, tome i., p. 121, &c. Add Unschuld. Nachricht., A.D. 1747, p. 957, &c.

(50) The palsgrave *Jo. Casimir*, in the year 1577, forthwith called a convention of the Reformed at Frankfort, for the purpose of repelling this Formula. See *Henry Alting's* Historia eccles. Palatinæ, § clxxix., p. 143, &c.

(51) See *Jo. Geo. Walch's* Introductio in libros symbolicos Lutheranor., lib. i., c. vii., p. 734, &c.

(52) On the fate of the Formula of Concord in Holstein, see die Dänische Bibliothek, vol. iv., p. 212, &c.; vol. v., p. 355; vol. viii., p. 333–468; vol. ix., p. 1, &c. *Henry Muhlius*, Dissertt. Histor. Theolog., Diss. i. de Reformat. Holsat., p. 108, &c. *Arn. Grevius*, Memoria Pauli ab Eitzen; who however, only touches upon this subject. The transactions in Denmark relative to the Formula and the causes of its rejection, may be learned from the above-mentioned Dänische Bibliothek, which contains numerous documents, vol. iv., p. 222–282: and from *Eric Pontoppidan's* Annales eccles. Danicæ diplomatici, tom. iii., p. 456, &c., who also shows, (p. 467, &c.), that what *Jo. Herm. von Elswich* and others endeavour to make doubtful, was a real fact, namely, that king *Frederic* II. on receiving a copy of the Formula, threw it into the fire and burned it. Respecting the rejection of the Formula by the Hessians, see the documents in der Dänischen Bibliothek, vol. vii., p. 273–364, vol. ix., p. 1–87. Add *Tielemann's* Vitæ Theologor. Marpurgens., p. 99, &c. Respecting the countries of Liegnitz and Brieg, see the Unschuld. Nachricht., A.D. 1745, p. 173, &c. [It cannot be denied, that there were

motives and arguments. Some of them, as the Holstenians, were led by their high respect and reverence for *Melancthon*, to abhor a book in which the opinions of so great a man were censured and exploded. Others were not only partial to *Melancthon*, but they also believed that some of the sentiments condemned in the *Formula*, were nearer the truth than the prevailing views. Some were kept from approving the Formula, by their secret attachment to the opinions of the Reformed; and some by the hopes they had indulged, that the Reformed and the Lutheran churches might form an alliance.(53) Some either actually feared or at least pretended to fear, that the peace and harmony of the Lutheran church might be injured, by adding a new symbolical book to their old ones. And others offered other reasons for their dislike of it.

§ 42. *Julius* duke of Brunswick, had been a kind of second father of the *Formula of Concord;* and had contributed to the fabrication of it, both by his counsels and by liberal expenditures. And when drawn up, he had commanded all the ministers of religion in his dominions, to receive it, and to subscribe their names to it. But after the *Formula* was published, *Julius* changed his mind, and permitted his divines at Helmstadt, *Tielemann Heshusius* and the others, to oppose it and to exclude it from a place among the symbolical books of his territories. The principal grounds on which the divines of *Julius* rejected the *Formula*, were: (I.) That the printed copy differed in some parts from the written *Formula*, which the Brunswickers had approved. (II.) That the doctrine of free-will was incorrectly explained in the Formula; and that some of the harsh and very unsuitable phrases of *Luther* were employed in it. (III.) That the *ubi-*

faults preceding this Formula of Concord, which gave to many Lutheran churches a reasonable excuse for procrastinating or even refusing to subscribe to it. It was published too hastily, and before the suggestions of all the churches had been received; whence many, as e. g., the churches of Pomerania and Holstein, believed that the Formula was sent to them only for form's sake. It was thought that the Saxons assumed a power in the whole transaction, which did not belong to them; and that they sought a kind of control over the Lutheran churches, which no one would in this sense concede to them.—*Schl.*]

(53) [It was the fact, that the Formula of Concord cut off all prospects of a union of our church with the Reformed, and opposed a bar to all attempts at pacification. At that time, the points in controversy with the Reformed, were only two; namely, respecting the doctrine of the supper, and the person of Christ. The first pervaded the whole Lutheran church; the second did not; for before the Formula of Concord, it was only the Swabian divines that defended the omnipresence of Christ's human nature, on the ground of a communication of attributes. *Luther* never attempted to prove his doctrine concerning the supper, from the doctrine de communicatione idiomatum; but solely from the scriptures. And if, when *Zwingle* (who would parry his proofs from scripture) brought him on to the subject of the person of Christ, he derived the ubiquity of Christ's human nature from its personal union with the divine nature; yet he never maintained, that the man Christ was *always* and *every where* present; but merely that he *could* be present, wherever the execution of his mediatorial office and the fulfilment of his promises, required; and of course, at the celebration of the holy supper. And in this, the theologians of upper and lower Saxony followed him. But the theologians of Swabia and Alsace maintained an absolute omnipresence; and their statements were transferred to the Formula of Concord, (yet so that the other opinion was not explicitly excluded), and thus were made articles of faith: (just as the doctrine of election by grace, was previously a private opinion of *Calvin*, and was transformed by the synod of Dort into an article of faith, to all that received the decrees of that synod). Thus the points of controversy between us and the Reformed, were increased by the Formula of Concord. They were also rendered more virulent, because we censured and condemned as heretical a church that hitherto wished to be a sister to us.—*Schl.*]

quity (as it was then termed) or the boundless presence of Christ's *human nature*, which the Lutheran church had never adopted as her doctrine, was taught in it. Besides these reasons, perhaps other and secret ones influenced duke *Julius* not to adopt the *Formula*. There were various negotiations with him and his theologians, to remove these difficulties; and particularly in the year 1583, a convention of theologians from the electoral Palatinate, Saxony, Brandenburg, and Brunswick, was held at Quedlinburg for the purpose of terminating this dissent: but *Julius* remained inflexible in his purpose, and wished to have the cause of the *Formula* referred to a council of the whole Lutheran church.(54)

§ 43. In Saxony itself, not a few detested in their hearts, that *Formula* which they subscribed with their hands; holding fast the doctrines which they had received from *Melancthon* and his friends. And these,—on the death of *Augustus* and the accession of *Christian* I., who from his childhood had been imbued with the milder sentiments of *Melancthon*, and is said to have been too friendly to the doctrines and institutions of the Swiss—again lifted up their heads, and seemed to be plotting against the *Formula of Concord*, in order to open the way for Calvinistic opinions and regulations to be introduced among the Saxons. And they found much support from men of the first rank, and especially from *Nicholas Crell*, the prime minister of state. Through their influence, first some laws were enacted which might prepare the minds of the people to acquiesce in the contemplated revolution; and then, in the year 1591, the formula of *exorcism* as it is called, was required to be omitted in the administration of baptism.(55) Moreover, not only was there a new German *catechism* published, which was favourable to the designs of these patrons of the Reformed doctrines, but likewise a new edition of the German Bible with the notes of *Henry Salmuth*, adapted to the object in contemplation, was prepared in 1591 at

(54) See *Leonh. Hutter's* Concordia concors, cap. xlv., p. 1051. *Phil. Jul. Rehtmeyer's* Braunschweig. Kirchenhistorie, vol. iii., ch. viii., sect. I, p. 483, and the writers mentioned by *Christ. Matth. Pfaff*, de Actis et scriptis ecclesiæ Würtemberg., p. 62, and in his Historia litterar. Theolog., pt. ii., p. 423. On the conference at Quedlinburg and its Acts, see also the Dänische Bibliothek, part viii., p. 595, &c. [The court appears to have been actuated in this matter, by political considerations. For the objections of the theologians to the *Formula*, might admit an answer. The first objection, respecting the discrepance between the printed and the written copies of the *Formula*, was founded on fact. There really were words and phrases interpolated in some of the statements, which were not in the written copy. The other party did not deny the fact; but said, they were minute things, and not alterations of the doctrine, but merely changes in the phraseology, introduced for the sake of perspicuity. And this was actually true. *Dr. Mosheim* once compared the subscribed copy with the printed; and, as he asserted, the doctrine in both was the same. So that if they had been disposed, they might easily have compromised this point. So also the two other points were not so very important. The Helmstadt theologians would not concede the ubiquity: yet they held it possible that *Christ*, as man, should be in various places at the same time. Now, how far is one who concedes this, from believing the ubiquity? The grand difficulty was this. The electoral Saxons had, in the whole business, assumed too much to themselves, and had acted as lawgivers to the church. It was perceived that if this matter was allowed to pass thus, the elector of Saxony would personate the pope, and his principal clergy the cardinals; and they would in future prescribe laws to the whole Lutheran church. They would therefore maintain, against the Saxons, their right to think for themselves in matters of religion, and would show, that they conceded to Saxony the direction of religious affairs, only under certain restrictions.—*Schl.*]

(55) See *Jo. Melchior Kraft's* Geschichte der Exorcismi, p. 401, &c.

Dresden. And as violent commotions and seditions of the people now broke out every where, the government animadverted severely on those ministers of religion who opposed the designs of the court. But the sudden death of *Christian*, which took place this very year, frustrated all these machinations. The theologians by whom the business had been principally managed, were, after the death of the elector, punished with imprisonment and exile; and *Crell* the prime director of it, received in 1601 the fruit of his temerity, by being brought to a capital punishment.(56)

§ 44. At the end of the century, *Samuel Huber* a Swiss of Bern, indiscreetly awakened a new controversy at Wittemberg where he taught theology. Fired with hatred of the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute decrees, he maintained, that the whole human race were from eternity elected of God to salvation; and he accused his colleagues, together with all the divines of the Lutheran church, of being Calvinists; because they taught that those only are elected, whom God foresaw would die in faith. Learned men are at this day agreed, that *Huber* swerved from the common Lutheran doctrine, in words rather than in meaning: for what the Lutherans maintain respecting the *love* of God as embracing the whole human race, and excluding no one absolutely from eternal salvation, this he would explain in a new manner and in new phraseology. But this age having learned from numerous examples, that new phraseology and new modes of explaining doctrines produced as lasting and as pernicious disturbance as new errors, urged *Huber* to adopt the old and universal method of teaching, in preference to his own. And when he declared that he could not do so, and his patrons here and there threatened to produce disturbance, he was compelled to relinquish his office, and go into exile.(57)

§ 45. That the controversies here recounted, and others of less magnitude, were very injurious to the public interests of the church founded by *Luther*, no one who is well informed in the history of those times, will deny. The method also of discussing and terminating controversies, in that age, if estimated according to the modern views of good men, contained much that was inconsistent with equity, moderation, and charity. And while they are unjust, who load with reproaches the *authors* of those evils, indiscriminately, and boldly pronounce them destitute of all reason and all virtue; those as still *more unjust*, who cast all the blame on the victors, and pronounce the vanquished to be saints and deserving of a better fate. That men recently led out of the thickest darkness into the light, should not at once discern and distinguish all objects, as they are able to do who have long been in the light, is not at all strange. Besides, that was an un-

(56) See *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. ii., book xvi., ch. xxxii., p. 863, and the writers mentioned by *Herm. Ascan. Engelcken*, Diss. de Nic. Crellio, ejusque supplicio: Rostoch, 1724.

(57) The writers on this controversy are mentioned by *Christ. Matth. Pfaff*, Introductio in Histor. litterar. Theolog., pt. ii., lib. iii., p. 431, &c. [See, in particular, *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, book xvi., ch. xxx., vol. i., p. 952, &c. It must not be supposed by the incautious reader, that *Huber* believed in the final salvation of all men. He used the words *decree* and *election*, as equivalent to *gracious invitation*. This he supposed, in the eternal counsels of God, extended to all men equally, and without distinction. But to make *their calling and election sure*, they must repent and believe; which, he supposed, the greater part of mankind *will not do*, and of course will be damned to all eternity. This he expressly stated in the confession of his faith, which he published in 1595. See *Arnold*, l. c., p. 953, and *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. iv., p. 664.—*Tr.*]

polished age, and one that not only tolerated but applauded many things in morals and in the modes of living, acting, and contending, which modern times, improved by experience and education, disapprove and reject. But with what views and intentions the individuals contended, whether they acted maliciously or ingenuously and in good faith, belongs not to us to decide, but to Him who knows the hearts of men.

§ 46. The theologians among the Lutherans, who illustrated the various branches of sacred learning, form a very long list. Besides *Luther* and *Melancthon*, who excelled all the rest in genius and learning, the more distinguished were, *Hieronymus Weller, Martin Chemnitz, John Brentius, Matthias Flacius, Urban Regius, George Major, Nicholas Amsdorf, Erasmus Sarcerius, John Matthesius, John Wigand, Francis Lambert, James Andreæ, David Chytræus, Nicholas Selnecker, Martin Bucer, Paul Fagius, Casper Cruciger, Victorin Strigelius, Cyriacus Spangenberg, Matthew Judex, Tielemann Heshusius, Joachim Westphal, John Æpinus, Andrew Osiander*, and many others.(58)

CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

§ 1. General Character of the Reformed Church.—§ 2. Causes of this Character.—§ 3. Origin of this Church.—§ 4. Zwinglian Contests respecting the Lord's Supper.—§ 5. History of them, till Luther's Death —§ 6. Transactions after his Death.—§ 7. Controversy respecting Predestination.—§ 8. The Height of it.—§ 9. Two Periods in the early History of this Church.—§ 10. Points of Difference between the Swiss and the Lutherans.—§ 11. *John Calvin* a principal Founder of this Church.—§ 12. The Doctrine and Discipline inculcated by Calvin.—§ 13. All the Reformed did not embrace his Views —§ 14. Progress of this Church in Germany.—§ 15. Progress in France.—§ 16. Progress in England and Scotland.—§ 17. Rise of the Puritans.—§ 18, 19. Their Opinions.—§ 20. Their Fundamental Principles.—§ 21. Sects among them. Brownists.—§ 22. The Dutch Reformed Church.—§ 23. Reformed Church of Poland. § 24. The Bohemian Brethren.—§ 25. Waldensians: Hungarians: Transylvanians.—§ 26. Churches which joined the Reformed.—§ 27. Diversity among the Reformed.—§ 28 Their Doctrines.—§ 29. Their Dissent from the Lutherans.—§ 30. Importance of the Difference.—§ 31. Ecclesiastical Power.—§ 32. Organization of the Church.—§ 33 Church Discipline.—§ 34. State of Learning.—§ 35. Biblical Expositors.—§ 36. Dogmatic Theology.—§ 37. Practical Theology.—§ 38. Calvin's Contest with the Spiritual Libertines.—§ 39. His Contests with the Genevans.—§ 40. Castalio.—§ 41. Bolsec.—§ 42. Ochin.—§ 43, 44. Controversy between the Puritans and the Episcopalians.

§ 1. The church which chooses to be called the *Reformed*, or the *Evangelical Reformed* church, and which was formerly by its opposers called the *Zwinglian* or the *Calvinistic* church, and is now by many called the

(58) For an account of these, *Melchior Adam's* Vitæ Theologorum, the historical and literary [and biographical] Dictionaries, *Lewis Elies du Pin's* Bibliotheque des Auteurs separés de la communion de l'Eglise Romaine, and others, may be consulted. The lives of many of them have been separately written, with care, in our age; e. g. the life of *Hieronymus Weller*, by *Laemmel*, of *Flacius* by *Ritter*, of *Heshusius* and *Spangenberg* by *Leuckfeld*, of *Fagius* by *Feuerlin*, of *Chytræus* by *Schütze*, of *Westphal* by *Arn. Grevius*, of *Bucer* by *Verporten*, of *Æpinus* by *Grevius*, &c.

Calvinistic Reformed,(1) differs in character from nearly all others. For all others stand united by the bond of a common system of doctrine and discipline; but this is not the case with the *Reformed church*. It neither holds to one system of faith, for it has many creeds considerably variant; nor adopts the same modes and forms of worship; nor has it every where the same constitution and government. Of course, this church does not require of its ministers, that they should all hold and teach the same things; but allows very many points of doctrine and those of no little consequence to be variously stated and explained, provided the great first principles of religion and piety remain inviolate. This church may therefore be called a great community, made up of various kinds of churches; which the moderation of all in tolerating dissent, keeps from splitting into various sects.(2)

§ 2. Such was not the original character of this church, but it was thrown into this state by the force of circumstances. The Swiss with whom it originated, and especially *John Calvin* who was the second father of it, spared no pains to bring all the congregations that united with them, to adopt the same forms of faith and practice and the same mode of government; and while they looked upon the Lutherans as brethren that were in error, they were not disposed to grant indulgence and impunity themselves, nor were they willing their associates should grant it, to those who openly favoured the Lutheran views of the Lord's supper, the person

(1) [In England and America, the term *Reformed* is commonly applied to all the different sects, which in this century separated from the Romish church: and the term *Protestant* is used with the same latitude. But the Lutheran writers use the term *Reformed*, to denote all the larger sects except their own, which separated from the Romish church during this century. In this sense *Dr. Mosheim* here uses it. It would have been more accurate however, had he said the *Reformed Churches*; for the sects he includes, do not pretend to be *one church* or *one ecclesiastical body*. They are, and they profess to be, as distinct from each other, as any or all of them are from the *Lutheran* church. See the following note.—*Tr.*]

(2) ["These observations are designed to give the *Lutheran* church an air of *unity*, which is not to be found in the *Reformed*. But there is a real fallacy in this specious representation of things. The *Reformed* church, when considered in the true extent of the term *Reformed*, comprehends all those religious communities that separated themselves from the church of *Rome*, and, in this sense, includes the *Lutheran* church, as well as the others. And even when this epithet is used in opposition to the community founded by *Luther*, it represents, not a single church, as the Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Independent, but rather a *collection of churches*; which, though they be invisibly united by a belief and profession of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity yet frequent separate places of worship and have each a visible centre of externa union peculiar to themselves, which is formed by certain peculiarities in their respective rules of public worship and ecclesiastical government. An attentive examination of the discipline, polity, and worship of the churches of *England*, *Scotland*, *Holland*, and *Switzerland*, will set this matter in the clearest light. The first of these churches, being governed by *bishops*, and not admitting the valadity of *Presbyterian ordination*, differs from the other three, more than any of these differ from each other. There are, however, peculiarities of government and worship, that distinguish the church of *Holland* from that of *Scotland*. The institution of *deacons*, the use of *forms* for the celebration of the sacraments, an ordinary *form of prayer*, the observation of the *festivals* of Christmas, Easter, Ascension Day, and Whitsuntide, are established in the Dutch church; and it is well known, that the church of *Scotland* differs from it extremely in these respects.—But after all, to what does the pretended uniformity among the Lutherans amount! are not some of the Lutheran churches governed by bishops, while others are ruled by elders! It shall moreover be shown in its proper place, that, even in point of doctrine, the Lutheran churches are not so very remarkable for their uniformity."—*Macl.*]

of Christ, predestination, and the kindred subjects.(2*) But when fierce contests arose in Britain, both respecting the form of church government, and respecting rites and some other subjects, between what were called the *Episcopalians* and the *Puritans*, it seemed to be necessary to expand the arms of the church, and to reckon among genuine brethren such as might deviate from the opinions and the regulations of the Genevans. And after the Synod of Dort, much greater moderation ensued. For although the opinions of the Arminians were rejected and condemned, they found their way into the minds of great numbers. The English church, in the time of *Charles* I., publicly renounced the opinions of *Calvin* respecting the divine decrees ;(3) and studied entire conformity with the opinions and practices of the first ages of Christianity. Some German churches dared not publicly assent entirely to the Genevan views, lest they should be declared to have cut themselves off from the privileges of the Augsburg Confession. Finally, the French exiles who had long been accustomed to milder views, and had philosophized in the free manner of their countrymen, having become dispersed over the whole Reformed world, by their eloquence and their talents allured many to imitate them. All these and some other circumstances have gradually instilled such a spirit of gentleness and patience, that at the present day all, except such as either adhere to the Roman pontiff or fiercely defend the errors of the Socinians, Anabaptists, or Quakers, can hold their place among the members of the reformed church. This has taken place contrary to the wishes and against the opposition of many ; but they are far inferior in numbers and influence to the others, who suppose there are but few things necessary to be believed in order to salvation, who allow many doctrines to be variously explained, and who wish to extend the Reformed church as widely as possible.(4)

[(2*) This sentence in connexion with what follows, seems to charge the Reformed of this century with excommunicating the Lutherans as heretics, or with refusing to have any Christian fellowship with them so long as they retained their peculiar opinions. Veniam tamen et impunitatem nec ipsi dabant, nec a suis dari volebant illis, &c. But on what grounds can *Dr. Mosheim* assert this? That the Reformed would not give up their own belief, nor admit that the Lutherans were free from all error, is certain. But that they refused all communion with their Lutheran brethren, is, I believe, the direct opposite of the truth. In the conference at Marpurg in 1529, of which some notice is given above, p. 37, note (45), and p. 43, § 27, the Reformed divines begged the Lutherans to allow them mutually to regard each other as brethren, notwithstanding their difference in opinion as to the eucharist But *Luther* absolutely refused. See the statements of Melancthon, Bucer, and others quoted by *R. Hospinian*, Historia Sacramentaria, pt. ii., p. 131, 133, 135, 136. So also *Calvin* in the year 1546, expressly declared, that the Lutherans and the Reformed ought not to separate from each other, and to call each other heretics, on account of the difference between them in regard to the real presence. See *Hospinian*, l. c., p. 311. And in the year 1631, the subject came before the Reformed national Synod of France at Lyons ; and they decided explicitly, that their churches might consistently admit open and avowed Lutherans to enjoy the privileges of members in their respective bodies. See *Jo. Aymon*, Synodes Nationaux des Egl. Ref. de France, tome ii., p. 500, &c., in *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Ref., vol. v., p. 194. See also cent xvii., sect. ii., pt. ii., ch. i., § 4., p. 358, &c., of this vol.—*Tr.*]

(3) ["Many members of the church of England, with archbishop *Laud* at their head, did, indeed, propagate the doctrines of *Arminius*, both in their pulpits, and in their writings. But it is not accurate to say that the *Church of England renounced publicly*, in that reign, the opinions of Calvin. See this matter farther discussed, in the note (m), [note (49)], cent. xvii., sec. ii., pt. ii., ch ii., § 20."—*Macl.*]

(4) There has never yet been published a full and accurate History of the Reformed

§ 3. The founder of the Reformed church was *Ulric Zwingle*, a Swiss, an acute man and a lover of truth.(5) He not only wished to have many things suppressed in the public worship and in the churches, which *Luther* thought might be borne with, images for instance, altars, candles, the formula of *exorcism*, the private [auricular] confession of sins, &c., and prescribed the most simple forms of worship; but he likewise taught on some points of doctrine, in particular respecting the Lord's supper, very differently from *Luther*. And those who laboured with him in banishing the popish superstitions among the Swiss, approved these singular opinions of *Zwingle*. From these men, all the churches of Switzerland which separated from the Romish communion, received those opinions. From Switzerland, by the preaching and writings of his pupils and friends, the same tenets spread among the neighbouring nations. Thus the Reformed church of which *Zwingle* was the parent, was at first small and of limited extent, but by degrees became an extensive body.

§ 4. The principal cause of the separation of the Lutherans from the Swiss, was *Zwingle's* doctrine concerning the Lord's supper. While *Luther* maintained that the body and blood of Christ are truly, though in an inexplicable manner, present in the holy supper, and are presented along with the bread and wine in that ordinance, *Zwingle* held on the contrary that the bread and wine are only signs and symbols of the absent body and blood of Christ; and he so taught in his public writings, from the year 1524 onward.(6) The next year, *John Œcolampadius*, a theologian of Basil and one of the most learned men of that age, did the same thing.(7) Both were opposed by *Luther* and his friends, and especially by the Swabians, with great firmness and resolution. *Philip* the landgrave of Hesse, fearing much injury to the incipient cause of the *Protestants* from these contests, endeavoured to put an end to them by a conference held at Marpurg in the year 1529, between *Zwingle*, *Luther*, and some others. But he could obtain only a truce, not a peace. *Luther* and *Zwingle* came to agreement on many points; but the controversy respecting the Lord's supper, was left for God and time to heal.(8)

§ 5. *Zwingle* had but just settled his church, when, in the year 1530, he fell in a battle of the Zurichers with the Roman Catholic Swiss, the defenders of the old religion. He marched out to this war, not for the purpose of

church. *Abraham Scultetus* would have given us one, down to his times, in his Annales Evangelii renovati; but only a very small part of that work has been preserved. *Theodore Hasæus*, who projected Annales Ecclesiæ Reformatæ, was cut off by a premature death. *James Basnage's* famous work, which was last published, Rotterdam, 1725, 2 vols. 4to, entitled: Histoire de la Religion des Eglises Reformées, is not a history of this church, but merely shows that the peculiar doctrines of the Reformed church are not novel, but very ancient, and have been held in all ages of the church. *Louis Maimbourg's* Histoire du Calvinisme is filled with innumerable errors, and written with the pen of partiality.

(5) See above, sec. i., History of the Reformation, p. 27, &c.

(6) Yet before that year, *Zwingle* had so believed and taught, in private. See *Dan. Gerdes*, Historia Evangelii renovati, tom. i., Append., p. 228.

(7) See *Jo. Conrad Fueslin*, Centuria i. Epist. theol. Reformatorum, p. 31, 35, 44, 49, &c. [See also, above, sect. i., ch. ii., p. 35, and note (45).—*Tr.*]

(8) *Abrah. Ruchat*, Histoire de la Reformation de la Swisse, vol. i., passim, vol. ii., livr. vi., p. 463, &c. *Jo. Henry Hottinger's* Helvetische Kirchengeschichte, pt. iii., lib. vi., p. 27, 51, &c., p. 483. *Val. Ern. Löscher*, Historia Motuum, pt. i., cap. ii., iii., p. 55, &c., cap. vi., p. 143, &c. *Jo Conr. Fueslin's* Beyträge zur Schweitzer-Reformation., tom. iv., p. 120, &c., [and above, p. 35, &c., note (45), and p. 43, § 27.—*Tr.*]

fighting, but for the sake of encouraging and comforting the soldiers, though he went armed, according to the customs of his country.(9) After his death, certain good and moderate men among the Lutherans, especially *Martin Bucer*, laboured with all zeal and diligence, by exhortations, explanations, and perhaps also by shrouding the opinions of both parties in ambiguous language, to bring about a compromise of some sort.(10) That those who undertook this difficult task had good intentions and designs, no one who is himself honest and candid, will call in question; but whether they took the right and proper method to accomplish their object, is less clear. In Switzerland, some commotions resulted from these movements of *Bucer*. For some refused to give up the opinion of *Zwingle;* while others embraced the explanations and the modified views of *Bucer*.(11) But these commotions had no influence to bring about a peace with Luther. But out of Switzerland, and among the theologians of upper Germany who had inclined to the side of the Swiss, *Bucer's* efforts to settle the controversy had such effect, that in the year 1536 they sent a deputation to Wittemberg and connected themselves with Luther, abandoning the Swiss.(12) The Swiss he could not persuade to do so; yet for some years afterwards the prospect of an agreement was not absolutely desperate. But in the year 1544, when *Luther* published his *Confession of faith respecting the Lord's supper*, in direct opposition to the opinions of the Swiss, the Zurichers the year following, publicly defended their cause against him; and by these movements all the efforts of the pacificators were rendered nugatory.(13)

§ 6. The happy death by which *Luther* was removed in 1546, seemed to dispel this cloud, and again to inspire the hope that a compromise might take place. For *Melancthon* and his friends and disciples so eagerly desired to have the Lutherans and Zwinglians unite, that he did not refuse even a dissembled peace, and would turn every way to accomplish it. On the other side, *John Calvin*, a native of Noyon in France and a teacher at Geneva, a man venerated even by his enemies for his genius, learning, eloquence, and other endowments, and moreover the friend of *Melancthon*, tempered the offensive opinion of *Zwingle*, and endeavoured to prevail with the Swiss, and especially with those of Zurich among whom his influence was very great, to adopt his views.(14) He rejected indeed the idea of the actual *presence* of the body and blood of Christ in the holy supper; but he supposed, a certain *divine influence* from Christ accompanied the bread and wine, to those who received them with full faith and

(9) Those of our church, who formerly reproached *Zwingle* and the Reformed church with this death, did not consider the customs of the Swiss nation in that age. For all the Swiss, when summoned to defend their country, were at that time obliged to march, and not even the religious teachers and ministers were excused. And in the very battle in which *Zwingle* fell, there fell likewise a doctor of Bern, *Hieronymus Pontanus*. See *Fueslin's* Centuria i. Epistolar. theol. Reformator., p. 84, &c.

(10) See *Alb. Menon. Verpoorten's* Comment. de Martino Bucero et ejus sententia de Cœna Domini, § ix., p. 23, &c., Coburg, 1709, 8vo. *Löscher's* Historia Motuum, pt. i., lib. ii., cap. i., p. 181, and pt. ii., lib. iii., cap. ii., p. 15.

(11) See *Fueslin's* Centuria i. Epistolar. Theol., p. 162, 170, 181, 182, 190, 192, 215.

(12) *Löscher*, loc. cit., cap. ii., p. 205. *Abrah. Ruchat*, Histoire de la Reformation de la Swisse, tome v., p. 535, &c. *Hottinger's* Helvet. Kirchen., vol. iii., book vi., p. 702, &c. [See p. 54, above, note.—*Tr.*]

(13) *Löscher*, l. c., pt. ii., lib. ii., cap. iv., p. 241, &c. [This *Confession* is a different work from *Luther's* large Confession, published in the year 1528.—*Tr.*]

(14) *Christ. August. Salig's* Historie der Augsburg. Confession, vol. ii., book vii., ch. iii., p. 1075.

an honest heart: and to render this doctrine the more acceptable, he expressed it in nearly the same phraseology in which *Luther* expressed his doctrine. For it was the common error of all who assumed the office of pacificators in this contest, or who attempted to restore harmony, that they endeavoured rather to produce agreement in words than in sentiment. But *Melancthon*, though extremely desirous of peace, neither had fortitude enough openly to engage in this perilous enterprise; nor would his opposers allow him tranquillity enough, after the death of *Luther*, to collect himself and begin the arduous business. Besides, the contention which had been intermitted, was renewed in 1552, by *Joachim Westphal*, a pastor at Hamburg; than whom, after *Flacius* there was no more strenuous vindicator of the sentiments of *Luther*. For to the *Mutual Consent of the Genevans and Zurichers in regard to the doctrine of the sacrament*, he opposed a book written in the caustic style of *Luther*, entitled, a *Farrago of confused and discordant opinions respecting the sacred supper, collected from the books of the Sacramentarians;* in which he bitterly taxed the Reformed with their disagreements on the doctrine of the supper, and most earnestly contended for the opinion of Luther. In a style no less harsh, *Calvin* first replied to him; and soon after, some joining *Westphal* and others joining *Calvin*, the parties became insensibly excited, and the contest raged even worse than before, and no human power seemed adequate to check it.(15)

§ 7. To these controversies an immense accession was made afterwards, by the contest respecting the decrees of God in relation to the eternal salvation of men; which was moved by *John Calvin*, and was very fruitful in abstruse and dark questions. The first teachers among the Swiss, were so far from the views of those who hold that God by his supreme and absolute sovereignty, appointed some to everlasting joy and others to everlasting pain, from all eternity, and without any regard had to their condition and conduct, that they seemed not far removed from the sentiments of the Pelagians; nor with *Zwingle*, did they hesitate to promise heaven to all who lived according to right reason.(16) But *Calvin* differing widely from them, supposed that God by his sovereign pleasure, assigns to mankind their future condition, and that his absolute decree is the only cause both of the eternal felicity and the eternal misery of all men.(17) And this opinion was in a short time, propagated by his writings and his pupils

(15) *Löscher's* Historia Motuum, pt. ii., lib. iii., cap. viii., p. 83, &c. *Jo. Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. iii., p. 642, &c. *Arnold Grevius*, Memoria Joachimi Westphali, p. 62, 106, &c.

(16) See this demonstrated by many proofs, in *John Daillé's* Apologia pro duabus ecclesiarum Gallicarum Synodis, adversus Frider. Spanhemium, pt. iv., p 946. *Jo. Alphon. Turrettin*, Epistola ad antistitem Cantuariensem; which is printed in the Bibliotheque Germanique, tome xiii., p. 92. *Rich. Simon*, Bibliotheque Critique, under the fictitious name of Samiore, tome iii., cap. xxviii., p. 292, 298. The author of the French notes to the Formula Consensus Helvetica, p. 52, &c. The very learned *Daniel Gerdes*, indeed, in his Miscellanea Groningens., tom. ii., p. 476, 477, seems to teach the contrary; namely, that *Calvin* held the same opinions as the first teachers among the Swiss. But he may be refuted by what he himself adduces concerning the disturbances in Switzerland produced by *Calvin's* opinions.

(17) [This statement appears quite too strong. Neither *Calvin* nor *Augustine* nor any other distinguished teacher of the divine decrees in ancient times, maintained that God's "absolute decree is the *only cause* of eternal felicity and eternal misery." On the contrary, they maintained that the sinfulness of men is the sole cause of their eternal misery. Neither did they suppose, that the righteous are saved, without any acts or agency of their own.—*Tr.*]

throughout the whole body of the Reformed, nay, was added to the public doctrines of the church in some regions. The Italian, *Jerome Zanchius*, who was devoted to the views of *Calvin*, first moved sad controversy on this subject at Strasburg, in the year 1560; and the controversy soon grew to such a height in the hands of various persons, that it may be questioned whether this, or the former controversy respecting the Lord's supper, contributed most to exasperate feelings and to confirm the schism [between the Lutherans and the Reformed].(18)

§ 8. The only prospect remaining to the Helvetians, that these animosities would be calmed and these great contests subside, depended on the Saxons, the pupils and followers of *Melancthon*, who after his death, as it was well known, laboured to find out some means of reconciliation. But being destitute of a leader of forecast, who could seize favourable opportunities, they applied remedies to the apparently mortal wound which rendered it absolutely incurable. For while they, as has been stated, endeavoured by means of certain publications, to corrupt the public teachers and the youth, or at least to induce them to tolerate the opinions of the Swiss, they drew ruin upon themselves and their project, and gave occasion for the formation of the noted *Formula of Concord*, which condemned the doctrines of the Reformed respecting the sacred supper and the person of Christ. And this, being received by the greatest part of the Lutherans among their rules of faith, was an insurmountable obstacle to all efforts of the pacificators.

§ 9. Thus far we have attended to the origin, causes, and progress of the schism, which separated the Reformed from the Lutherans. We must next look into the internal state, the history, and the growth of the Reformed church. The history of the Reformed body during this century, should be divided into two periods; of which the first extends from the year 1519, when *Zwingle* began to form a church separate from the Romish community, on to the time when *John Calvin* settled at Geneva, and obtained an absolute ascendency among the Reformed. The latter period embraces the remainder of the century. In the first period, the church, (which afterwards assumed the title of *Reformed*, in imitation of their neighbours the French, who distinguished themselves from the Roman Catholics by this title), was of no great extent, being almost confined to Switzerland. Some small states indeed in the adjacent countries of Swabia and Alsace, as Strasburg and a few others, adhered to the side of the Swiss:(19) but these in the year 1536, by the influence of *Bucer*, abandoned the Swiss, reverted back to the Saxon community and became rec-

(18) See *Löscher's* Historia Motuum, pt. iii, lib. v., cap. ii., p. 27, &c., cap. x., p. 227. *Salig's* Historie der Augsburg. Confession, vol. i., book ii., ch. xiii., p. 441, &c.

(19) [Among these states, besides Strasburg where *Wolfgang Fabricius*, *Capito*, and *Martin Bucer* were entirely on *Zwingle's* side, were the following: Reutlingen, where the pastor *Conrad Herman* was of *Zwingle's* opinion; Ulm, where the preacher *Conrad Somius*, and Constance, where *Ambrose Blaurer* adhered to *Bucer*; Augsburg, where *Martin Cellarius* and *Wolfgang Musculus* adhered to the Reformed religion; Memmingen and Lindau, which with Strasburg and Constance, at first refused to subscribe to the Augsburg Confession, and presented a separate one called *Tetrapolitana*, (that *of the four cities*). But all these were persuaded by *Bucer*, to subscribe to the Augsburg confession, and to accept the Wittemberg agreement. In Strasburg especially, the Reformed lost all public offices, after the contests of *Jerome Zanchius* with *John Marbach*, *John Sturm*, and *John Pappus*; and their community at last fell to the ground. See *Löscher's* Historia Motuum., vol. ii., p. 283, &c.—*Schl.*]

onciled with *Luther*. The other churches that revolted from the Romish pontiff, had either embraced openly the sentiments of *Luther*, or were composed of persons of diverse sentiments, who may be considered as of neither party. And within these narrow limits, the church collected by the efforts of *Zwingle*, would perhaps have remained stationary, had not *John Calvin* arisen. For as the Swiss are contented with their own country, and not solicitous to extend their empire, so they seemed not anxious for the extension of their church.(20)

§ 10. In this first age of the Reformed church, nothing else separated it from the Lutheran, but the controversy respecting the *Lord's supper:* out of which arose another, respecting the *person of Jesus Christ;* which however the whole Lutheran church never made its own controversy. For when the Swabian divines in their disputes with the Swiss, drew an argument in proof of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacred supper, from the doctrine of the communication of the divine attributes (*omnipresence* in particular) to the *human* nature of Christ, in consequence of the hypostatic union;(21) the Swiss, to meet this argu-

(20) [*Dr. Mosheim* is still blinded by his theory of the *unity* of the Reformed church; on which remarks were made in notes (1) and (2) of this chapter. He seems moreover in this section, to represent what he calls the Reformed church as being originally a little schismatic body of Helvetians, headed by Zwingle and a few other obstinate men whose influence did not extend far, while the mass of those who forsook the Romish church were disposed to follow after *Luther*. This schismatic body was also long held in check by the Lutherans, and several portions of it had been actually reclaimed, when *John Calvin* arose, infused into it some new errors, and spread it far and wide in many countries. Such is the view given by Mosheim. But the truth is, that while the Reformation was going on, simultaneously, in most countries of Europe, under different leaders, all actuated by a similar zeal for detecting and exposing the errors of the Romish church, when the popish doctrine of transubstantiation came under their review, it was generally seen to be absurd and untenable. But when *Luther's* attention was called to this subject, by some of his associates that were in advance of him on this point, he could see no objection to admitting the real or bodily presence of Christ in the eucharist; and he would therefore tolerate no other change in this doctrine but the substitution of *consubstantiation* instead of *transubstantiation*. This led to bitter contention, and to actual schism among the reformers. Luther would hold no fellowship with such as denied the real presence; and so great was his influence and authority, that he actually arrested the progress of reformation at this point in most of the countries of Germany. But in all other countries, with the exception of Sweden and Denmark, he could not arrest it. Hence the Swiss, the French, the Belgians, the English, and the Scotch, severally set up their reformed national churches, all independent of each other, and actually differing in several minor points, yet all with one voice discarding both the popish and the Lutheran doctrine concerning the eucharist.—As for *John Calvin*, he was at the head of only a portion of the Swiss church, but he possessed such talents and wisdom as procured him an influence among all Protestants, greater than that of any other man then on the stage. Yet he did little directly to *extend* the Reformation into other countries. He rather enlightened the communities already reformed, and brought them to greater uniformity in doctrines and discipline. Indeed most of the national churches except the Lutheran, embraced substantially his doctrinal views. Even the Lutherans began to make advances towards them, when opposition was raised by the strenuous adherents to Luther's creed, and after violent internal commotions the Lutheran church succeeded in purging itself of nearly every vestige of Calvinism.—*Tr.*]

(21) [Especially *Brentius* and *Jamcs Andreæ;* the former in his Sententia de libello Bullingeri, Tubingen, 1561, 4to, and still more largely, in his book de personali unione, et de divina majestate Christi; as also in his Recognitio doctrinæ de vera majestate Christi, Tubingen, 1564, 4to, and *Andreæ* in his Assertio de persona et unione, 1565, 4to. Also in the Conference of Maulbronn in 1564, this subject was much discussed; and the Tubingen divines published in 1565, their Declaratio et Confessio majestatis Christi. *Christopher* duke of Würtemberg, sent this production of his divines to *Augustus*, the elector of Saxony, and requested him

ment, denied the communication of the divine properties to the human nature of Christ; and opposed, in particular, the omnipresence of the *man* Christ. Hence originated the very troublesome controversy respecting the *communication of attributes*, and the *ubiquity* as the Swiss termed it; which produced so many books and subtile disquisitions and so many mutual criminations. During this period the Swiss in general followed the opinion of *Zwingle* respecting the Lord's supper, which differed from that of *Calvin*. For this father of the Swiss church believed, that the bread and wine only *represent* the body and blood of Christ, or are *signs* and emblems of the blessings procured for the human race by the death of Christ; and therefore, that Christians derived no other benefit from coming to the Lord's supper, than that of meditation on the merits of Christ, or, as the patrons of this sentiment used to express themselves, *the Lord's supper is nothing but a memorial of Christ.*(22) *Martin Bucer*, for the sake of peace, laboured to correct and amend this doctrine of the holy supper, and to make it appear more like—nay actually allied, to that of Luther. But the remembrance of *Zwingle* was too fresh, to allow the Swiss to be drawn off from his opinion.

§ 11. The Reformed church assumed an entirely new aspect, when *John Calvin* in the year 1541, returned to Geneva from which he had been driven, and obtained the direction of the new Genevan church,(23) as well as vast influence in the republic. He was of Noyon in France, and a man with whom few of his age will bear any comparison for patient industry, resolution, hatred of the Roman superstition, eloquence and genius. Possessing a most capacious mind, he endeavoured not only to establish and bless his beloved Geneva with the best regulations and institutions, but also to make it the mother and the focus of light and influence to the whole Reformed church, just as Wittemberg was to the Lutheran community,—from which to enlarge and extend the Reformed church; in short, his aim was to shape this whole church after the model and pattern of that of Geneva. This was truly a great undertaking, and one not unworthy of a great mind; and it was an undertaking, no small part of which he actually accomplished, by his perseverance and untiring zeal. In the first place therefore, by his writings, his epistles, and other means, he induced very many persons of rank and fortune to emigrate from France, Italy, and other countries, and to settle at Geneva; and others in great numbers took journeys to Geneva, merely to see and hear so great a man. In the next place, he persuaded the senate of Geneva in 1558, to establish an academy at Geneva, in which he and his colleague *Theodore Beza*, and other men of great erudition and high reputation were the teachers. This new academy ac-

to get the opinion of his divines respecting it. But these found much to set aside in this doctrine, which they regarded as novel and dangerous. See *Hutter's* Concordia concors, p. 49, &c., 61, &c.—*Schl.*]

(22) That this was *Zwingle's* real opinion respecting the sacred supper, is demonstrated by numerous proofs, in the Museum Helveticum, tom. i., p. 485, &c., 490; tom. iii., p. 631. I will adduce only one short sentence from his book de Baptismo, in his Opp., tom. ii., p. 85. Cœna Dominica non aliud, quam *commemorationis* nomen meretur. Compare, in various places, *Füslin's* Centuria i. Epistolar. theol. Reformatorum, p. 255, 262, &c. [See above, p. 54, note (2).—*Tr.*]

(23) *Calvin* was in fact superintendent at Geneva; for he presided till his death, over the body of the clergy, and in the *Consistory* or ecclesiastical judicatory. But when dying, he proved, that it was dangerous to commit to one man perpetually an office of so much authority. See *Jac. Spon's* Histoire de Geneve, tome ii., p. 111, &c. And therefore, after him, the Genevan church had no standing president.

quired in a short time so much distinction and glory, in consequence of its teachers, that students eagerly repaired to it in great numbers, from England, Scotland, France, Italy, and Germany, in pursuit of sacred as well as civil learning. By these his pupils *Calvin* enlarged every where the Reformed church, and recommended and propagated his own sentiments, to more than one nation of Europe. He died in 1564; but his institutions continued vigorous after his decease, and the academy of Geneva in particular, flourished under *Theodore Beza*, no less than under *Calvin* himself.(24)

§ 12. The theology taught by *Zwingle*, was altered by *Calvin*, principally in three respects. (1.) *Zwingle* assigned to civil rulers full and absolute power in regard to religious matters, and,—what many censure him for,—subjected the ministers of religion entirely to their authority. He moreover did not object to a gradation of offices among religious teachers, nor to a standing superior over the ministers of parishes. But *Calvin* circumscribed the power of the magistrate in matters of religion, within narrow limits; and maintained that the church ought to be free and independent, and to govern itself, by means of bodies of presbyters, synods, and conventions of presbyters, in the manner of the ancient church; yet leaving to the magistrate the protection of the church, and an external

(24) The wise and vigorous conduct of *Calvin* in the church and in the republic of Geneva, is elucidated with many documents never before published, by the learned man who republished with enlargements, *Jac. Spon's* Histoire de Geneve, 1730, 4to and 8vo. See tom. ii, p. 87, &c, p. 100, &c., and other passages. [*Calvin* was not the first reformer of Geneva, but *William Farell* a zealous clergyman of Dauphine, who preached the Gospel with acceptance there as early as the year 1532, but was driven from the city by the instigation of the bishop. His successor, *Anthony Froment*, met the same fate. But as the internal state of the city became changed, and the council, which had hitherto been on the side of the bishop, abandoned him, and he left the city in 1533, the two preachers were recalled; and they, in connexion with a third *Peter Viret*, gathered a numerous church in Geneva; so that in the year 1535, the reformation became supported by the council. Yet the full organization and establishment of the church was the work of *John Calvin*. He was born in the year 1509; and in his studies connected law with theology, studying the former at the command of his father, and the latter from his own choice; and from *Melchior Volmar*, a German and professor of Greek at Bourges, he acquired a knowledge of the evangelical doctrines. After the death of his father, he devoted himself wholly to theology, and publicly professed the reformed doctrine, which he spread in France with all diligence. His name soon became known in Switzerland as well as France; and *Farell* and *Viret* besought him, as he was travelling through Geneva, to remain there and aid them in setting up the new church. But in the year 1538, great dissension arose in Geneva; and *Calvin* and his assistant *Farell*, severely inveighed from the pulpit against the conduct of the council, which resolved to introduce the ceremonies agreed on at Bern, in the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper, and to reject those which these ministers wished to have adopted: and the consequence was, that *Calvin* and *Farell* were banished from the republic. *Calvin* now spent a considerable time, as a preacher and a professor at Strasburg; where he lived in great intimacy with *Bucer* and *Capito*, and with them very strenuously defended the cause of the Protestants in Germany, both orally and in his writings. But in the year 1541, at the repeated and pressing invitations of the Genevans, he returned to them again, and there officiated with great perseverance, zeal, prudence, and disinterestedness, till his death in the year 1564. His great talents and virtues were shaded by the love of control, by a want of tenderness, and by passionate rigour against the erring. His works have been published in nine volumes, folio; among which, his Institutes of the Christian religion, and his exegetical writings, are most valued.—*Schl.* His life was written by *Beza*, and is prefixed to his Letters. See also *Middleton's* Evangelical Biography, vol. i., p. 1, &c. *E. Waterman's* Memoires of J. Calvin, Hartford, 1813, 8vo; *Beza's* Life of Calvin, translated by *Fr. Sibson*, with copious notes by an American editor, Philad., 1836, 12mo; and *Bayle's* Dictionary, art. *Calvin*.—*Tr.*]

care over it: in short, he introduced at Geneva, and he endeavoured to introduce throughout the Reformed church, that form of church government which is called *Presbyterian;* for he did not allow of bishops and gradations among ministers, but maintained, that (*jure divino*) by divine appointment, they ought all to be on a level, or be equals. He therefore established at Geneva a judicatory or *consistory*, composed of *ruling elders* or *lay presbyters*, and *teaching elders;* and he assigned to them great power. He also established conventions or synods: and in these consistories and synods, he caused laws to be enacted relating to religious matters. He also among other things, reinstated the ancient discipline, by which offenders were excluded from the church. All these things were effected, with the consent of the greater part of the senate.—(II.) To facilitate a pacification with the Lutherans, he substituted in place of the Zwinglian doctrine concerning the Lord's supper, another doctrine in appearance more like that of *Luther*, indeed not greatly differing from it. For while *Zwingle* admitted only a *symbolical* presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacred supper, and promised no other benefit from its celebration, than the calling to mind the death of Christ and the blessings procured by that death; *Calvin* admitted a sort of *spiritual presence;* that is, he held that the regenerate, in the exercise of faith, do become united in a certain way to the man Christ, and from this union receive an increase of spiritual life. And as he used the phraseology of *Luther* on this subject, and acknowledged among other things, that *divine grace* was *conferred* and *sealed* by the sacred supper, he was thought by many to believe in what is called *impanation*, or to agree very nearly with *Luther*.(25) According to

(25) See *Füslin's* Centuria i. Epistolar. Theolog. Reformator., tom. i., p. 255, 260, 262, 263, &c. Lettres de Calvin à Mr. Jac. de Falaise, published a few years since at Amsterdam, p. 84, 85. *Calvin* himself wrote to *Bucer*, (in *Füslin*, l. c., p. 263), that he approved of *his* sentiment. Perhaps he received his own opinion from *Bucer*. See *Jac Benign. Bossuet's* Histoire des variations des Eglises Protestants, tome ii., p. 8, &c., p. 14, 19. *Courayer's* Examen des defauts des Theologiens, tome ii., p. 72, &c., who endeavours to show, that *Calvin's* sentiments respecting the Lord's supper were nearly the same as those of the Roman Catholics. But he is in general very obscure on the subject, and does not express himself uniformly; so that it is difficult to ascertain his real opinion. ["The term *Impanation* (which signifies here the *presence* of Christ's body in the eucharist, *in* or *with* the *bread*, that is there exhibited) amounts to what is called *Consubstantiation*. It was a modification of the monstrous doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, first invented by some of the disciples of *Berenger*, who had not a mind to break all measures with the church of Rome, and was afterwards adopted by *Luther* and his followers, who, in reality, made sad work of it. For, in order to give it some faint air of possibility, and to maintain it as well as they could, they fell into a wretched scholastic jargon about the nature of *substances*, *subsistences*, *attributes*, *properties*, and *accidents*, that did infinite mischief to the true and sublime science of gospel theology, whose beautiful simplicity it was adapted to destroy. The very same perplexity and darkness, the same quibbling, sophistical, and unintelligible logic, that reigned in the attempts of the Roman Catholics to defend the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, were visible in the controversial writings of the Lutherans in behalf of *Consubstantiation*, or *Impanation*. The latter had, indeed, one absurdity less to maintain; but being obliged to assert, in opposition to intuitive evidence, and unchangeable truth, that the *same* body can be in *many* places at the same time, they were consequently obliged to have recourse to the darkest and most intricate jargon of the schools. The modern Lutherans are grown somewhat wiser in this respect; at least, they seem less zealous than their ancestors about the tenet in question."—*Macl.* The Lutherans of the present day, wisely reject the opinion of *Luther*, and the doctrine of their symbolical books. Thus *Breitschneider* writes, in 1819, (Entwickelung, &c., p. 715), "The modern systematic divines either change,—as do *Zecharia*, *Reinhard*, *Storr*,—the præ-

Zwingle's opinion, all Christians whatsoever, whether regenerate or in their sins, can be partakers of the body and blood of *Christ:* but according to *Calvin*, none can, except the regenerate and the holy. (III.) The celebrated doctrine of an *absolute decree* of God respecting the salvation of men, which was unknown to *Zwingle*, was inculcated by *Calvin:* that is, he taught, that God had no other ground for his electing some persons from all eternity to everlasting life, and appointing others to everlasting punishments, except his own pleasure, or his most free and sovereign will.

§ 13. The first of these three doctrines, neither *Calvin* nor his disciples could persuade all the Reformed churches to adopt; for instance, the Germans, the English, and even the Swiss: yet he persuaded the French, the Dutch, the Scotch, and some others. The Swiss would by no means allow the form of church government established by *Zwingle*, and the prerogatives of the magistrates in matters of religion, to be changed. And on the two other points, there was very warm debate in Switzerland for a long time. For the inhabitants of Zurich, Bern, &c., were utterly averse to parting with the doctrine they had learned from Zwingle respecting the sacred supper.(26) Nor were they easily persuaded to admit the Calvinistic doctrine of *predestination*, among the doctrines of the church.(27) Yet by the perseverance, the high reputation, and the prudence of *Calvin*, after very warm altercations, a reconciliation between him and the Swiss was effected, first in regard to the Lord's supper in 1549 and 1554, and afterwards in regard to predestination.(28) After this, his pupils were so successful as gradually to bring nearly the whole Reformed church to embrace his new opinions: to which event, his own writings contributed not a little.(29)

§ 14. Let us next survey the countries, in which the Reformed religion as shaped by *Calvin*, obtained a fixed and permanent residence. Among the German princes, *Frederic* III. elector Palatine, in the year 1560, substituted followers of *Calvin's* doctrines in place of the Lutheran teachers whom he removed, and ordered his subjects to receive the rites and opinions of the Genevans.(30) His successor *Lewis*, in the year 1576, rescinded the acts of his father and restored the Lutheran doctrine to its former dignity and authority. But this fell again, on the accession of *John Casimir* to the government of the Palatine countries in 1583; for he had gone over to the side of the Reformed with his deceased father(31) *Frederic*

sentia realis of the body and blood of Christ, into a præsentia operativa, a presence of Christ, not in substance, but in operation; or they deny altogether,—with *Henke*, *Eckermann*, *De Wette*, *Wegscheider*,—the presence of the celestial body of Christ, in the sense maintained by the ancients."—*Tr.*]

(26) See *Füssli's* Centuria Epistolar., p. 264. Museum Helvet., tom. i., p. 490; tom. v., p. 479, 483, 490; tom. ii., p. 79, &c.

(27) See Museum Helveticum, tom. ii., p. 105, 107, 117. *Dan. Gerdes*, Miscellanea Gröningens. nova, tom. ii., p. 476, 477. I omit the common writers, as *Ruchat*, *Hottinger*, &c.

(28) See the Consensus Genev. et Tigurinor., in *Calvin's* Opuscula, p. 754, &c.

(29) *Dan. Ern. Jablonsky*, in his Epistolæ ad Leibnitium, published by *Kapp*, p. 24, 25, 41, contends that there is no longer any one among the Reformed, who holds to *Zwingle's* opinion respecting the Lord's supper. But it is certain, there are many such: and at the present day, his opinion has in a sense revived, in England, in Switzerland, and in other countries.

(30) *Henry Alting's* Historia Eccles. Palatina; in *Lud. Christ. Mieg's* Monumenta Palatina, tom. i., p. 223, &c. *Löscher*, Historia Motuum, pt. ii., lib. iv., cap. iv., p. 125. *Salig's* Historie der Augsburg. Confession, vol. iii., book ix., ch. v., p. 433, &c.

(31) [In the original, it is not *father*, but *brother:* which is a manifest error of the press. For *John Casimir* was not the brother of *Frederic* III., but his son.—*Schl.*]

III., and it was necessary again to give Calvinism the pre-eminence.(32) From that time onward, the Palatine church held the second rank among the Reformed churches; and it possessed such influence over the others, that the religious instructions composed for its use by *Zechariah Ursinus*, and denominated the *Heidelberg Catechism*, were received nearly throughout the whole body.(33) In the republic of Bremen, *Albert Hardenberg* a friend of *Melancthon*, in the year 1556, first attempted to propagate the Calvinistic doctrine respecting the Lord's supper. And although his attempt for the present was unsuccessful, and he was expelled the city, yet it was impossible to withhold the Bremensians from uniting with the Reformed church towards the close of the century.(34) In what manner other portions of the German population were gradually brought to relish the doctrines of *Calvin*, must be learned from those who undertake to write a full history of Christianity.

§ 15. The first among the French who abandoned the Romish religion, are commonly called Lutherans, by the writers of those times: and from this name and some other circumstances, the inference has been drawn, that they were all believers in *Luther's* doctrines and averse from those of the Swiss.(35) To me they appear to have been a mixed company of various sorts of persons. The vicinity however of Geneva, Lausanne, and other cities which embraced the Calvinistic system of doctrines and discipline, and the astonishing zeal of *Calvin*, *Farell*, *Beza* and others, in fostering, encouraging, and multiplying the opposers of the Romish see in France, induced them all before the middle of the century arrived, to profess themselves the friends and brethren of the Genevans. By their enemies they were contumeliously denominated *Huguenots:* the origin of which appellation is uncertain. They were however tossed by various tempests and misfortunes, and endured greater calamities and sufferings than any other portion of the Protestant church; and this, notwithstanding they could number exalted princes and nobles of the nation, among their party.(36) Even the peace which they obtained from *Henry* III., in 1576, proved the commencement of a most destructive civil war; in which the very powerful family of *Guise*, being set on by the Roman pontiffs, endeavoured to overthrow and extirpate the Reformed religion together with the royal family; and on the other hand, the Huguenots, led on by generals of

(32) *Alting*, loc. cit., p. 223, 245. *Löscher*, l. c., pt. iii., lib. vi., p. 234. But especially *Burch. Gotth. Struve's* Pfälzische Kirchenhistorie; who has learnedly treated of these events, p. 110, &c.

(33) On the Heidelberg or Palatine Catechism and Confession, see *Jo. Chr. Kocher's* Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolicæ, p. 593 and 308 [and especially his Catechetical History of the Reformed churches; in which he treats particularly of the history of the Heidelberg Catechism; Jena, 1756, 8vo.—*Schl.*]

(34) *Salig*, loc. cit., pt. iii., book x., ch. v., p. 715, and ch. vi., p. 776, &c. *Löscher*, loc. cit., pt. ii., lib. iv., ch. v., p. 134, and pt. iii, lib. vi., ch. vii., p. 276. *Gerdes*, Historia renovati Evangelii, tom. iii., p 157 [and especially his Historia Motuum Ecclesiasticor. in civitate Bremensi, ab anno 1547, ad an. 1561, tempore Alberti Hardenbergii suscitatorum, ex authenticis monumentis: Groningen, 1756, 4to; also reprinted in his Scrinium Antiquar. seu Novæ Miscellan. Groningenses, tom. v., pt. i. See also the Brem-und Verdische Bibliothek, vol. iii., pt. iii., no. 5.—*Schl.*]

(35) See *Löscher's* Historia Motuum, pt. ii., cap. vi., p. 46. *Salig's* Historie der Augsburg. Confession, vol. ii., book v., ch. v. and vi., p. 190, &c.

(36) See Histoire Eccles. des Eglises Reformées au Royaume de France, in three volumes, Antwerp, 1580, 8vo, which is commonly ascribed to *Theodore Beza*. The writers on the Gallic church and its Confession of faith, are enumerated by *Köcher*, Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolicæ, p. 299, &c.

the highest rank, fought for their religion and their kings with various success. These horrible commotions, in which both parties committed many acts that posterity must ever reprobate, were at length terminated by the prudence and heroism of *Henry* IV. The king himself, perceiving that his throne would never be firm and stable if he persevered in spurning the authority of the pontiff, forsook the Reformed religion and embraced the old faith; but on the other hand, he published the edict of Nantes, in 1598, in which he gave to the Reformed who he saw could not be subdued, full liberty to worship God in their own way, and likewise the greatest security that was possible.(37)

(37) *Elias Benoit*, Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes, tome i., livr. v., p. 200, &c. *Gabr. Daniel's* Histoire de France, tome ix., p. 409, &c., of the last Paris edition. *Boulay's* Historia Acad. Paris., tom. vi., the whole volume. [For a sketch of the rise and progress of Protestantism in France, till the death of *Francis* I., in 1547, see note (60), p. 47, &c., of this volume. During the reign of *Henry* II., the son and successor of *Francis*, or from 1547 to 1559, the persecution of the Reformed was still more systematic, determined, and unsparing. In 1551, the civil courts were required to co-operate with the spiritual, and to exterminate all heretics. The estates of all emigrants on account of religion, were to be confiscated. No books whatever might be imported from any Protestant country; and to print, or sell, or possess Protestant books, was made penal. Many were imprisoned and put to death. In 1555, the civil courts were forbidden to hear appeals from the ecclesiastical; and all magistrates were to execute the decisions of the latter. The parliament of Paris refused to register this decree; and made a noble remonstrance to the king. In 1557, the king appointed commissioners, to aid the bishops in exterminating all heretics; but the parliament refused to register this decree. In 1558, cardinal Lorrain, with the consent of the king, established a limited Inquisition. But several of the courts still favoured and protected the Protestants; and the king summoned a meeting called a *mercurial;* and learning that a number of his judges secretly favoured the Reformers, he imprisoned several of them, and one was put to death. But amid all their persecutions, the Protestants multiplied greatly, during this reign. Two princes of the blood, the king of *Navarre* and the prince of *Condé*, and a great number of the nobility and gentry, were their friends and supporters. Hence they set up churches every where, had regular preachers, and stated though generally secret meetings for worship. In 1559, the king of *Navarre* and the prince of *Condé* encouraged and attended meetings of some thousands for worship, in a meadow near Paris, in open day; at the close of which the people publicly marched into the city. In the same year, the Protestants held their first national synod privately at Paris; and there adopted a confession of faith, catechism, and directory for worship, composed by *Calvin;* and likewise formed a system of church government. Their doctrines were strictly Calvinistic; their worship very simple, and almost without written forms; and their system of government entirely Presbyterian. Single churches were governed by *Consistories*, (Sessions), composed of the pastors and ruling elders, many of whom were noblemen. From the Consistories, lay appeals to the *Colloquies* or *Classes*, (Presbyteries), composed of pastors and elders deputed from the Consistories, and meeting twice a year. From these Colloquies, there were appeals to the *Provincial Synods*, composed of all the Colloquies in a province and meeting once a year. *National Synods* were composed of one pastor and one elder from each of the 16 Provincial Synods. This supreme ecclesiastical tribunal did not meet regularly, but as occasion required; and at each meeting, some province was named to call the next meeting. From A.D. 1559 to the year 1659, there were 29 National Synods holden; which heard appeals, answered cases of conscience, revised their rules and regulations, and transacted various concerns of the whole body. (See their acts published by *John Quick*, entitled Synodicon in Gallia Reformata, London, 1692, 2 vols. fol.)—*Francis* II., a youth of 16, and feeble both in body and mind, succeeded his father *Henry* II. in 1559. His mother *Catharine de Medicis*, the duke of *Guise* and his brother the cardinal of Lorraine, all decided Catholics, in fact ruled the nation, and endeavoured to crush the Reformation. The king of *Navarre*, the prince of *Condé*, the admiral *Coligni*, and others friendly to the Protestants, conspired to overthrow the power of the *Guises:* but they were betrayed, and thus involved themselves and all the Protestants in persecution. Many perished; numbers fled the country; and still more were imprisoned, robbed of their property, and variously harassed, during the

§ 16. The Scotch church honours *John Knox*, a disciple of *Calvin*, as its founder: and from him of course it received from its commencement the doc-

17 months of this reign. In 1560, *Charles* IX., aged eleven years, succeeded his brother Francis, till 1574. His mother was regent. To secure her power, she now sought the friendship of the king of *Navarre*, and of the Protestants; and even listened herself to Protestant preachers. She needed money; and the states general were assembled in 1561; but they did nothing but wrangle. The Catholics demanded the extirpation of all heretics; and the Protestants demanded toleration. The court issued a decree forbidding religious disputes, releasing the imprisoned Protestants, and allowing toleration to all who would externally conform to the established religion, unless they chose to quit the country. The provincial authorities favourable to the Protestants, carried the decree into effect; the others would not. In July, 1561, there was a fruitless conference of Catholic and Protestant divines at Poissy, to effect a compromise between the two religions. Though the country was in great disorder, the Protestants were prosperous, and continually multiplying. To prevent murders and seditions, the court persuaded the people of both religions to give up their arms, and to trust to the protection of the government. In January, 1562, a national convention met at St. Germain, and agreed that the Protestants should be allowed to hold private worship, till a general council should decide all religious disputes. The Protestants were not quite satisfied with this; but the Catholics were outrageous. Tumults ensued. The king of *Navarre*, to gain an addition to his territory, abandoned the Protestants, and summoned the duke of *Guise* to the capitol, to suppress the tumults. He obeyed; and passing through Vassi in Champagne, found a Protestant assembly holding worship in a barn. His soldiers commenced a quarrel with them, and then murdered 260 of their number. A civil war now broke out. The Protestants made Orleans their headquarters, and had the prince of *Condé* and admiral *Coligni* for leaders; while the Catholics were commanded by the duke of *Guise*, the king of *Navarre*, and the constable *Montmorency*. Much blood was shed, and many towns taken and ravaged. The king of *Navarre* fell in battle; the duke of *Guise* was assassinated; *Montmorency* and *Condé* were both taken prisoners. Peace was concluded at Amboise, March, 1563, on the ground of a general amnesty for the past, and free toleration of Protestant worship in particular places throughout France. The treaty was not well observed; and the Protestants, finding the court determined on their ruin, renewed the war in 1567, under *Coligni* and the prince of *Condé*. *Montmorency* fell, and many other noblemen on both sides. Peace was concluded early in 1568, on nearly the same terms as before. But three months after, hostile movements on the part of the court, caused the war to be renewed with increased violence. The prince of *Condé* fell in battle, in 1569: but the queen of *Navarre*, with her son, and the young prince of *Condé*, all zealous Protestants, now appeared in the field. Peace was concluded in 1570, on the conditions of amnesty for the past, free toleration of the Protestants every where, a limited right to except against Catholic judges, and the possession of four cities, (Rochelle, Cognac, Montauban, and la Charité), for two years, to be garrisoned by Protestants. To lull the Protestants into security, the court now enforced the terms of the treaty with much apparent zeal, proposed a marriage between the young king of *Navarre* and the king's sister, and at length drew *Coligni*, the king of *Navarre*, and the prince of *Condé*, to appear at court. All this was preparatory to the assassination of the Protestants, by order of the king and queen mother, on St. Bartholomew's eve, Aug. 22, 1572. The bloody scene began at midnight, at the signal of tolling the great bell of the palace, and continued three days at Paris. *Coligni* was the first victim. With him, five hundred noblemen, and about 6,000 other Protestants were butchered in Paris alone. Orders were despatched to all parts of the empire, for a similar massacre everywhere. More than 30,000,—some say 70,000,—perished by the hands of the royal assassins: and the pope ordered a jubilee throughout Christendom. The Protestants were weakened, but not destroyed. Losing all confidence in the government, they entered into combinations for their safety. The prince of *Condé* escaped from his prison, and went to Germany to form alliances in their behalf. *Charles* IX. died in 1574, and was succeeded by his brother, *Henry* III., a dissolute man, and a violent Catholic. Civil war raged again: but peace was concluded in 1576. The Protestants were to enjoy freedom of worship everywhere, except at Paris and within two miles of the king's residence. Courts half Catholics and half Protestants, were to be established in the principal cities; and ten cautionary towns were to be given them. The Catholics, dissatisfied as usual with concessions of liberty to the Protestants,

trines, institutions, and government of the Genevans. And in maintaining these pure and uncontaminated, it ever has been and still is, so zealous, that in the seventeenth century, it did not hesitate to avenge with the sword the temerity of those who would introduce something foreign into it.(38)—In

combined with the pope and the king of Spain, and obliged the king to abrogate his decrees for giving effect to the treaty. The war was renewed in 1577, and continued with some interruptions till 1580; when the Protestants were again allowed their former liberties, and their cautionary towns for six years. But in 1584, the Catholic chiefs, particularly the *Guises*, formed a league with *Philip* king of Spain, for exterminating the Protestants, and transferring the crown of France to the family of *Guise* on the demise of the present king. War was of course renewed with the Protestants, at the head of whom was the king of *Navarre* and the prince of *Condé*. The *Guises* and their allies checked the Protestants, but alienated the king, who caused the duke of *Guise* to be assassinated. *Henry* III. now found himself so odious to the Catholic league, that he was obliged to make peace with the king of *Navarre* and the Protestants; and they generously supported him, till his death in 1589. The king of *Navarre* was the next legal heir to the crown of France, which he assumed, with the name of *Henry* IV., and was supported by all the Protestants, and by the Catholics who adhered to the late king. But the leaguers refused to acknowledge him; and he had to contend several years for his crown. At length in 1595, to put a stop to the civil wars, he professed the Catholic religion. Yet he gave free toleration to his Protestant subjects. In 1598, he published the edict of Nantes, as the basis of their liberties; and by it, he confirmed to them all the privileges ever before conceded to them; gave them equal civil rights, and equal privileges in the universities and public schools; allowed them courts, half Protestant and half Catholic, in the principal cities; made them eligible to all public offices; and allowed them to establish public worship, in places of a particular description, throughout the realm. He also gave them an annual stipend of about 40,000 crowns, for the support of their ministers. And though the Catholics murmured, and endeavoured to infringe upon their rights, *Henry* protected them to the end of his reign, in 1610.—The number of Protestants in France, during the last half of this century, was supposed to be from a million, to a million and a half. At one time, (1571), they claimed to have 2150 churches: but many of them were only *family churches*, or the households of the nobles. The number of regular churches, stated in the acts of their national synods, was generally from 700 to 800. Some of these were vastly large, and had three, four, and even five pastors; while others were very small, and were joined two or three together under one pastor. They could reckon men of great learning and talents among them. They were in close fellowship with the church of Geneva, and with the Flemish Protestants. Their adherence to their creeds and also their discipline, were strict. Take an example. In 1578, the Consistory of Rochelle debarred the prince of *Condé* the communion, because one of his ships had taken a prize after the signing of the last peace; which he continued to hold as a lawful prize, because the capture was made before the forty days assigned for the publication of the treaty had expired. He appealed to the National Synod; but it decided against him. See *Quick's* Synodicon, vol. i., p. 122. For the facts in this note, I am indebted chiefly, to *Gifford's* history of France, vol. iii.; *Quick's* Synodicon, vol. i., and *Ingram Cobbin's* Historical View of the Reformed church of France, London, 1816. For a more full and circumstantial account, see *M. Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit. der. Reform., vol. ii., p. 239–348.—*Tr.*]

(38) *Salig's* Histoire der Augsburg. Confession, vol. ii., b. vi., ch. i., p. 403.—[Some notice of the first dawning of the Reformation in Scotland, was given in note (64), p. 49, above. *James* V. died in 1542; and left his crown to an infant daughter, only a few days old, *Mary* queen of Scots. At the age of six years, she was affianced to the dauphin of France, afterwards *Francis* II.; and was sent to be educated in that country, and did not return to Scotland till after the death of her husband in 1561. During these 19 years, Scotland was governed by the queen dowager, *Mary* of *Guise* widow of *James* V., and by a series of regents. At the commencement of this period, the Reformed doctrines were spreading slowly, without noise, and with little direct opposition. But in February, 1546, cardinal *Beton*, the archbishop of St. Andrews, seized and burned at the stake *George Wishart*, a Reformed preacher. This excited great indignation: and *Norman Lesly*, a young nobleman, with an armed force surprised and murdered the cardinal in his castle, and held possession of it fourteen months. During this time the reformed doctrines were preach-

England the case was very different. This nation never could be persuaded to submit itself entirely to the decisions of Geneva; nor did it long

ed freely at St. Andrews, and among others, by the famous *John Knox*. On the reduction of St. Andrews, *Knox* and most of the prisoners were sent out of the country. The same year *Henry* VIII. died; and the Reformation in England went forward rapidly, under *Edward* VI. This excited the Scotch to emulation; and several of the nobles embraced the Reformation. The queen dowager, for political reasons, found it necessary to treat the Protestants with indulgence. In 1553, *Edward* VI. of England died; and was succeeded by his sister *Mary*, a violent Catholic, whose bloody persecutions drove great numbers of her subjects into foreign countries, several of them into Scotland. This also strengthened the Reformation there. The Scotish clergy possessed about half the wealth of the country, and the nobles were eager to get their estates; while *they*, ignorant and dissolute, were willing to allow Protestant doctrines to spread, so long as they could enjoy their revenues. In 1554, the queen dowager was made regent. Her partialities to the French so disgusted the nation, that to maintain her power, she had to favour still more the Protestants. In 1555, *John Knox* returned to Scotland; and he and other zealous preachers spread the reformed doctrines with great success. The queen dowager kept many of the bishoprics and richer benefices vacant, in order to enjoy their revenues; and others she filled with persons devoted to her: and both alienated the more zealous Catholics, and weakened the power of the clergy. In 1558, the archbishop of St. Andrews commenced persecution. But the Protestants, who were now nearly half the nation, were indignant, and applied to the queen regent, who gave them protection. The next year however, through French influence, she abandoned the Protestants and took sides with the Catholic clergy. In May, 1559, she summoned most of the Reformed ministers to appear at Stirling, to answer for their conduct. They set out, attended by noblemen and immense crowds of armed companions. She was afraid to meet them; and sent them a discharge, on condition that they should peaceably return to their homes. They did so: and she then basely proceeded to try them; and for their nonappearance, pronounced them all *outlaws*. The Protestants in their rage, attacked the churches and monasteries, destroying images, altars, crosses, &c. The queen resolved to quell them by force; and a civil war ensued. After various contests, the Protestants having been frequently deceived by the queen, determined to remove her from the regency. They also found themselves so strong, that they demanded more than a bare toleration; and being aided by queen *Elizabeth*, they obtained a complete triumph. The queen dowager died; and the French and English embassies, which met in Scotland in 1560, negotiated a peace, by which the Protestants were left at full liberty, and all religious disputes were committed to the adjustment of a Scotish parliament. The French and English troops were both withdrawn; and a full parliament was assembled, which overturned the whole system of popery, and established Protestantism in its stead. These acts of parliament were sent to France, for the queen's ratification. At the close of this year *Francis* II. died; and his queen *Mary*, the next year, 1561, returned to Scotland to take the government of the country into her own hands. The first general assembly of the Scotish church was held in December, 1560. Here a Calvinistic creed and a Presbyterian form of government, as delineated in the First Book of Discipline, were adopted. Five of the pastors were made standing superintendents or visiters of the churches, instead of bishops; pastors and teachers, readers and exhorters, and annual elders and deacons, were the church officers; and church sessions, synods, and general assemblies were to be the judicatories. The clergy in vain attempted to persuade the government to transfer the funds of the Catholic churches to the Protestant. But the parliament of 1561, undertook to purge the land of idolatry; and "abbeys, cathedrals, churches, libraries, records, and even the sepulchres of the dead, perished in one common ruin." The queen did not ratify the acts of the parliament of 1560 subverting popery; and in opposition to them she set up the mass in her own chapel; yet she allowed the Protestants for the present, free toleration, and also chose her council chiefly from among them. Many of the richer benefices were still held by Catholics, while others were in the hands of the Protestants; and parliament unanimously decreed, that all the incumbents should continue to enjoy their revenues, yet each paying over a third part of his income to the public treasury. In 1563, the queen had not yet sanctioned the legal abolition of popery, and the Protestant nobles did not see fit to urge it. This provoked the ministers and especially *Knox*, to utter violent denunciations and to commit some outrages; but the prudence of the nobles prevented

retain unaltered, what it did receive from that quarter. It is pretty well attested, that the greatest part of those Englishmen who first renounced the superstitions of their fathers, were more inclined to the opinions of *Luther* respecting the holy supper, the mode of public worship, and the government of the church, than to those of the Swiss. But after the death of *Henry* VIII., the industry of *Calvin* and his disciples, especially *Peter Martyr*, caused the former opinions to be excluded, and the latter to gain admission into the universities, the schools, the pulpits, and the minds of the majority.(39) Hence, in the reign of *Edward* VI., when they came to deliberate what system of doctrine and discipline to establish, the English embraced the communion of the Genevans; yet with this limitation, that they would retain the old organization of the church, which was very different from that of Geneva, together with some rites and ceremonies which most of the Reformed regard as very superstitious. Yet this diversity, slight as it might then be deemed, and to be borne with, as *Calvin* himself attested, afterwards produced numerous perils, calamities, and wars, to the injury both of the church and the commonwealth of England.

§ 17. This lamentable schism, which to this day no means have been able to heal, commenced with those who fled to save their lives and liberties in the year 1554, when *Mary* reigned or rather *raged*, in England. Some of these celebrated their public worship, according to the liturgy established by *Edward* VI., but others preferred the more simple and in their view more pure worship of the Swiss. The former were denomina-

any fatal consequences. In 1565, the queen married *Henry* lord *Darnly*, a weak and insolent young man, who soon rendered himself odious to his queen and to most of the nation. The next year, the queen was delivered of a son, *James*, afterwards *James* VI., of Scotland. In 1566, *Mary* at the instigation of the French, began to form projects for establishing popery. The next year, lord *Darnly* was murdered; and *Bothwell* the queen's favourite, who aspired to the throne, persuaded her to sanction the legal establishment of Protestantism. The scandalous marriage of the queen with *Bothwell*, induced the nobles to seize the person of the infant prince *James*, for whose safety they were solicitous. This act, and the loud demands for an investigation of the murder of *Darnly*, produced a civil war; in which the queen was taken, forced to resign her crown to her son, and confined in Lochleven. Escaping, she renewed the war without success; and retiring into England, she threw herself upon the generosity of queen *Elizabeth*; who kept her a prisoner twenty years, and then caused her to be beheaded, on a charge of treasonable practices in England. Being thus delivered from a Catholic sovereign in 1567, the Protestants of Scotland found no difficulty in fully establishing, during the minority of *James*, their own religion, and suppressing entirely that of the Catholics. Notwithstanding many were friendly to episcopacy, the Presbyterian system of government was universally adopted, as laid down in the Second Book of Discipline. Generally, three or four contiguous churches were united and had one church session in common, from which lay appeals to the provincial synods; and these sessions, which were called *elderships*, afterwards became *presbyteries*, when the individual churches were provided with distinct sessions. *James* VI., on assuming the government, was a zealous Protestant, though somewhat inclined to episcopacy, and disposed to make himself head of the church. He curbed the insolence of the clergy, who claimed liberty to denounce public men and measures from the pulpit, as they had done in the preceding unsettled times. There were warm disputes respecting the boundaries between the civil power and the ministerial prerogative; the expediency of admitting bishops; and the disposition to be made of the old ecclesiastical funds. In 1603, queen *Elizabeth* died, and *James* VI. of Scotland succeeded to the throne of England, under the name of *James* I.—See *Robertson's* History of Scotland: *M'Crie's* Life of John Knox; and *Ja. Scott's* Lives of the Protestant Reformers in Scotland.—*Tr.*]

(39) See *Löscher's* Historia Motuum, pt. ii., lib. iii., cap. vii., p. 67, and the authorities he quotes: *Salig's* Historie der Augsburg. Confession, vol. ii., b. vi., ch. iii., p. 317, &c., and others.

ted *Conformists*, because they conformed their worship to the pattern legally established by *Edward*; the latter were called *Nonconformists* and also *Puritans*, because they desired greater purity in worship and did not regard the liturgy of king *Edward* as free from all the dregs of superstition. These appellations have continued in use; and to this day they designate the Christian communities by which Great Britain is divided. When the exiles returned to their country on the accession of *Elizabeth* to the throne, this controversy being introduced into England, soon became so great and threatening that the more sagacious even then despaired of any reconciliation. The wise queen did not confine the reformation to the rigorous principles of the Genevans and their followers the Puritans, but she enjoined on those to whom she intrusted this business, to follow the patterns of the early ages rather than that of the Genevans.(40) When she had modelled the whole church and especially the public worship on these principles, she published the celebrated *Act of Uniformity*, requiring all Englishmen to observe her regulations. The *Puritans* urged, that they could not in conscience yield obedience; and they bitterly complained, that the discarded superstitions of popery were reinduced. The more ardent insisted, that these regulations should be wholly removed, and that the church should be regulated according to the principles of the Genevans; while the more temperate merely requested liberty, to worship God themselves according to their own opinions. The queen determining to show no indulgence to either, employed all the means which penal laws and her own sagacity could afford, in order to suppress the obstinate sect. And thus *that* purification of the old religion, by which the English church is equally distinguished from the popish and from all the others that have renounced the dominion of the pontiff, was confirmed and established; and at the same time a foundation was laid for permanent discord, to the vast injury of this otherwise happy nation.(41)

(40) [" *Dr. Mosheim* seems disposed, by this ambiguous expression of the *primitive ages*, to insinuate that queen *Elizabeth* had formed a pure, rational, and evangelical plan of religious discipline and worship. It is however certain, that, instead of being willing to strip religion of the ceremonies which remained in it, she was rather inclined to bring the public worship still nearer to the Romish ritual, (*Heylin*, p. 124), and had a great propensity to several usages in the church of Rome, which were justly looked upon as superstitious. She thanked publicly one of her chaplains, who had preached in defence of the *real presence;* she was fond of images, and retained some in her private chapel; (*Heylin*, p. 124), and would undoubtedly have forbid the marriage of the clergy, if *Cecil*, her secretary, had not interposed. (*Strype's* Life of Parker, p. 107, 108, 109.) Having appointed a committee of divines to review king *Edward's* liturgy, she gave them an order to strike out all offensive passages against the pope, and to make people easy about the corporeal presence of Christ in the sacrament. (*Neal's* Hist. of the Purit., vol. i., p. 138.)"—*Macl.*]

(41) No one has treated this subject more fully, or more agreeably, than *Daniel Neal*; whose *History of the Puritans* or *Protestant Nonconformists*, was published not long since at London, in four volumes. The first volume of this elaborate work was printed, London, 1732, 8vo, the last volume appeared in 1738. Yet the author, who was himself a *Puritan*, could not so command his party feelings and his passions, as entirely to avoid sectarian zeal. For while he is full in narrating and emblazoning the wrongs which the bishops inflicted, or caused to be inflicted upon the Puritans, he frequently extenuates, excuses, or passes silently over the faults of the *Puritan* sect. The reader may also consult *Jo. Strype's* Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury under queen Elizabeth, namely, *Parker*, *Grindal*, and *Whitgift;* which are written with great copiousness and labour. [See also *Bogue* and *Bennet's* History of Dissenters, vol. i., London, 1809, and *Benjamin Brook's* Lives of the Puritans, vol. i., London, 1813.—*Tr.*]

§ 18. The first cause that gave rise to so many strange and calamitous events, was very trivial, and of no consequence to religion and piety. The leaders of the *Puritans* held in abhorrence those garments which the English clergy wore for the sake of distinction in their public assemblies. For these garments having been derived from the papists, were in their view the *badges of Antichrist*. From this they proceeded to other matters, of somewhat greater importance. First, they conceived that the constitution of the English church, was a departure from the form established by Christ; and they maintained, what they had learned from *Calvin* and the Genevans, that all the ministers of religion ought, by divine appointment, to be equal in rank and authority. They had indeed no objections to allowing an individual to bear the title of bishop, and to preside in the meetings of his brethren for the sake of preserving order; but they would not allow him to claim the prerogatives of the old bishops, to rank among the peers of the realm, to be employed in civil affairs, and be distinguished by wealth and power. The weight of this controversy was not great, so long as the English prelates founded their rank and authority upon the laws of the land and human constitution; but it became of vast moment from the year 1588, when *Richard Bancroft*, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, first ventured publicly to affirm that bishops are an order superior to that of presbyters, not by mere human appointment, but by the will of God.(42) This sentiment meeting the approbation of great numbers, the consequence was, what might be anticipated, that none were deemed properly inducted into the sacred office, unless they were ordained by a bishop; and that the ministers of those churches which have no bishops, were thought to lack the qualifications necessary for their office, and to be inferior to the popish priests.

§ 19. In the next place, the Puritans conceived that those churches, which from being the residence or seat of the bishops are called *cathedrals*, ought to be done away, together with all who live upon their revenues, the archdeacons, the deans, the prebendaries and the canons: they also disapproved of the mode of worship usually practised in cathedrals; and in particular, denied that instrumental music and chanting were proper in the worship of God. They likewise thought that not only the vicious, but also persons of dubious piety, should be excluded from the church. For it being their opinion that the church is the company of the faithful, they of course held that care should be taken lest any who are destitute of faith should creep into it. They required many alterations in those rites and ceremonies, which were enjoined by the authority of the queen and the supreme council.(43) For instance, they deemed all holy days conse-

(42) See *Jo. Strype's* Life and Acts of John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 121, Lond., 1718, fol. [*Neal's* Hist. of the Puritans. vol. i., ch. vii., p. 180, &c.—*Tr.*]

(43) [*Dr. Maclaine* supposes the *supreme council* here mentioned, to be the noted *high commission court*. But that *court* was an *executive* and *visitatorial* body, not *legislative*. It seems therefore, that *Dr. Mosheim* intended by the *supreme council*, either the British *parliament*, or perhaps the queen's privy council, which possessed much the same powers as a German prince with his Consistorial council. The queen with her privy council repeatedly published *Injunctions*, or, regulations for the church, which she enforced by the episcopal and the high commission courts; and these arbitrary decrees of the queen were substituted for acts of parliament, which she more than once forbid to legislate on such subjects; so that she assumed to be the real lawgiver of the English church. See *Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. i., ch. iv., p. 167, &c. Yet the account which *Dr. Maclaine* here gives of the *high commission court*, is worth re-

crated to the memory of the saints, to be unlawful; they would prohibit the sign of the cross in various transactions, but especially in the sacrament of baptism; they were displeased with the employment of sponsors or godfathers and godmothers, at the baptism of infants whose parents were still living;(44) nor would they allow newborn infants to be baptized by any persons but the priests; they would not have the sacred books of secondary rank, or those commonly denominated the *Apocrypha*, to be read and expounded to the people; the stated forms of prayer, they would not indeed wholly exclude from public worship, but they demanded that the teachers should be allowed to vary from them and to alter them, as they saw fit, and be permitted to pray to God in their own language, and not merely in the words of others; in short, they conceived that the worship of their country ought to be conformable to the principles and institutions of the Genevans, and that nothing should be tolerated that was coincident with the Romish worship.

§ 20. These opinions could not well be defended or impugned, without calling in the aid of certain general principles, which would support the positions adopted; and from which the importance of the controversy may be estimated. Those who took sides with the queen and the supreme council, maintained, I. that the right to *reform* or to abolish and correct errors and defects, both in doctrine and in discipline and worship, belonged to the civil magistrate. The *Puritans* on the contrary, denied that God had assigned this office to the magistrate; and held with *Calvin*, that it

peating. "This court," (says he) "took its rise from a remarkable clause in the *act of supremacy*, by which the queen and her successors were empowered to choose persons *to exercise, under her, all manner of jurisdiction, privileges, and pre eminences, touching any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the realms of England and Ireland, as also to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, contempts, offences, enormities whatsoever;* provided, *that they have no power to determine any thing to be heresy, but what has been adjudged to be so by the authority of the canonical scripture, or by the first four general councils, or any of them; or by any other general councils, wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of canonical scripture, or such as shall hereafter be declared to be heresy by the High Court of Parliament, with the assent of the clergy in Convocation.* Upon the authority of this clause, the queen appointed a certain number of *commissioners* for ecclesiastical causes, who, in many instances, abused their power. The court, they composed, was called the *Court of High Commission*, because it claimed a more extensive jurisdiction and higher powers, than the ordinary *Courts of the Bishops*. Its jurisdiction reached over the whole kingdom, and was much the same with that which had been lodged in the single person of lord *Cromwell*, vicar general to *Henry* VIII. These *commissioners* were empowered to make inquiry, not only by the legal methods of juries and witnesses, but by all other ways and means which they could devise, that is, by rack, torture, inquisition, and imprisonment. They were vested with a right to examine such persons as they suspected, by administering to them an oath (not allowed of in their commission, and therefore called *ex-officio*), by which they were obliged to answer all questions, and thereby might be obliged to accuse themselves, or their most intimate friends. The fines they imposed were merely discretionary; the imprisonment to which they condemned was limited by no rule but their own pleasure; they imposed, when they thought proper, new articles of faith on the clergy, and practised all the iniquities and cruelties of a real *Inquisition*. See *Rapin's* and *Hume's* Histories of England, under the reign of Elizabeth; and *Neal's* History of the Puritans, passim."—*Tr.*]

(44) ["Other rites and customs displeasing to the Puritans, and omitted by our author, were, *kneeling at the sacrament of the Lord's supper, bowing at the name of Jesus, giving the ring in marriage*, the prohibition of marriage during certain times of the year, and the licensing it for money, as also the *confirmation of children* by *episcopal* imposition of hands."—*Macl.*]

was rather the business of the ministers of Christ to restore religion to its purity and dignity. II. The former supposed, that the rule of proceeding in reforming the doctrine and discipline of the church, was not to be derived exclusively from the holy scriptures, but also from the writings and the practice of the early ages of the church. The *Puritans* on the other hand, maintained that the divinely-inspired books were the only pure source, from which could be derived rules for purging and regulating the church, and that the enactments and the doctors of the early ages, had no authority whatever. III. The former declared the church of Rome to be a true church, though much deformed and corrupted; they said, the Roman pontiff presumptuously indeed claims to be the head and monarch of the whole church, yet he must be acknowledged to be a legitimate bishop; and of course, the ministers ordained by his authority, have the most perfect right to minister in holy things. It was necessary for the English prelates to inculcate such principles, if they would trace back the origin and prerogatives of their office to the apostles of Christ. But very different were the views of the *Puritans*. They constantly maintained that the Romish church had forfeited the title and the rights of a true church; that its bishop was the very *Antichrist;* that all its discipline and worship were vain, superstitious, and opposed to the precepts of the gospel; and of course, that all communion with that church was to be shunned as pestilential. IV. The former deemed the best form of the church to be that, which prevailed in the four or five first centuries; indeed, that it was preferable to that established by the apostles themselves; because *they* gave such a shape to the church as suited its infantile and nascent state, and left to those who should come after them to regulate it more perfectly, when it should become fully established and extended. On the contrary, the *Puritans* contended, that all the principles of church government were laid down in the scriptures; and that the ambassadors of Christ set forth an unchangeable pattern which was to be imitated by all succeeding ages, when they directed the first Christian churches to be regulated and governed in the manner then practised in the Jewish congregations [or *Synagogues*].—V. The former contended, that things indifferent which are neither commanded nor forbidden by the holy scriptures, such as the rites of public worship, the attire of the priests, the festivals, &c., the supreme magistrate may regulate and establish, according to his pleasure; and that to disobey his laws on these subjects, is as sinful as to violate his laws relative to civil affairs. But the *Puritans* contended, that it was improper and wrong to impose as necessary things, what *Christ* himself had left free; for thus the liberty which *Christ* has procured for us, is subverted. They added, that such rites as tend to infect the mind with superstition, can by no means be regarded as indifferent, but must be avoided as impious and profane. And such, in their estimation, were those ancient ceremonies which the queen and the parliament refused to abrogate.(45)

(45) [" *Dr. Mosheim*, in these five articles, has followed the account of this controversy given by Mr. *Neal*, in his History of the Puritans. This latter adds a *sixth* article, not of debate, but of union. Both parties (says he) agreed *too well* in asserting the necessity of a uniformity of public worship, and of calling in the sword of the magistrate for the support and the defence of their several principles, which they made an ill use of in their turns, as they could grasp the power into their hands. The standard of uniformity, according to the bishops, was the *queen's supremacy*, and *the laws of the land*; according to the Puritans, *the decrees of provincial and national synods*, allowed and en-

§ 21. This contest of the court and bishops with those who called aloud for a farther reformation of the church, would have been far more severe and perilous, if those who bore the common name of *Puritans* had been agreed in their opinions and feelings. But this body was composed of persons of various dispositions and characters, whose only bond of union was their dislike of the religion and discipline established by law; and therefore it very soon became divided into sects, some of which were both misled themselves and misled others by fanatical imaginations, and others displayed their folly by devising strange and unusual forms for the constitution of churches. Among these sects, none is more famous than that which was formed about the year 1581 by *Robert Brown*, an unstable and fickleminded man. He did not differ materially from either the Episcopalians or the other Puritans, as to the doctrines of religion; but he had new and singular views of the nature of the church and of the regulation and government of it. He first distributed the whole body of Christians into small associations, such as those collected by the apostles: because so many persons as could conveniently be assembled in one place, and that of moderate dimensions, he affirmed, constituted a church, and enjoyed all the powers and privileges of a church. And each of these small congregations, he pronounced to be independent and free, by divine constitution, from all jurisdiction both of bishops who according to the court, and of synods which according to the Puritans, have the right of governing the church. The supreme power to provide for the welfare and the peace of these little associations, according to his views, resided in the people; and all the members had equal powers and prerogatives. The congregated multitude therefore, deliberated on sacred subjects; and whatever was voted by the majority, was considered as legitimately decided. The brotherhood selected certain persons from among themselves, to teach publicly and to administer ordinances; and if the interests of the church seemed to require it, they remanded these teachers of their own creation, again to a private station. For these teachers were in no respects more sacred or elevated, than the rest of the brethren, except by their power to perform sacred functions, for which they were wholly indebted to the election and consent of the brethren. Moreover the office of teaching was by no means confined to them; but all the brethren, if they pleased, might prophecy in public, or exhort and instruct the fraternity. Hence, when the appointed preacher of the church had closed his discourse, the brethren severally were at liberty to hold forth, and to exhibit what they might have been revolving in their minds, or had not clearly apprehended in the discourse of the preacher. In short, *Brown* thought that the Christian world should now present the same aspect, as that of the churches in the days of the apostles. In maintaining such opinions, he and his associates were so assuming as to hold that all bonds of harmony, communion, and charity, with churches differently constituted, were to be severed; and to declare that the English church in particular was above all others to be shunned, as being a spurious church, contaminated with the pollutions of popery, and destitute of all divine influences. This sect, impatient under the great injuries it received (perhaps through its own fault) in England, removed to

forced by the civil magistrate. But neither party were for admitting that liberty of conscience, and freedom of profession, which is every man's right as far as is consistent with the peace of the government under which he lives."—*Macl.*]

Holland, and settled at Middleburg, Amsterdam, and Leyden: but it did not long continue. *Brown* himself returned to England, and forsaking his new opinions, obtained a parsonage in the established church. The other exiles became embroiled by many internal dissensions.(46) These effects induced the wiser among them to modify the discipline of their founder, and make it more tolerable. In this manner, from them originated the noted sect of the *Independents* or *Congregational Brethren*, which still exists. But their history belongs to the next century.

§ 22. In the provinces of the Netherlands, it was long doubtful, whether those who renounced the Romish communion would join the fellowship of the Lutherans, or that of the Swiss; for each of these had many and strong partisans.(47) But in the year 1571, the preference was publicly given to the Swiss. For the *Belgic Confession* of Faith,(48) which was published in this year, was for the most part in unison with that adopted by the French Reformed church; and differed from the Augsburg Confession in several respects, and especially on the doctrine of the Lord's supper.(49) The causes of this will readily appear, if we consider the proximity of the French and the number of them residing in the Netherlands, the high reputation of *Calvin* and the Genevan school, and the indefatigable industry of the Genevans in extending the boundaries of their church. From this period, the Belgians publicly assumed the title of the *Reformed*, instead of that of *Lutherans* which they had before borne: and in this they followed the example of the French, who had invented and first assumed this appellation. So long however as the Belgians were subject to the Spaniards, they disused the term *Reformed* to avoid incurring odium, and styled themselves *Associates of the Augsburg Confession:* because, the Spanish court looked upon Lutherans as far better citizens, than the disciples of *Calvin*, who from their commotions in France, were deemed more inclined to sedition.(50)

§ 23. The knowledge of a more sound religion was carried into Poland, by the disciples of *Luther* from Saxony. Afterwards, not only the Bohemian brethren whom the Romish priests had expelled from their country, but likewise some of the Swiss, disseminated their opinions among the Poles; not to mention the Anabaptists, the Antitrinitarians, and others, who travelled in that country, and there collected congregations.(51)

(46) *Dan. Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. i., ch. vi., p. 324. *Jo. Hornbeck's* Summa controversiarum, lib. x., p. 738, &c. *Fuller's* Ecclesiastical History of Britain, b. x., p. 168. [*Benj. Brook's* Lives of the Puritans, vol. ii., p. 366, &c.—*Tr.*]

(47) *Löscher's* Historia Motuum, pt. iii., lib. v., cap. iv., p. 74.

(48) For an account of the Belgic Confession, see *Köcher's* Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolicæ, p. 216. [It was first composed in the Walloon language, by *Guy de Bres*, and first printed in French, in 1562. Afterwards it was translated into various languages; and was ratified (together with the Heidelberg Catechism, with which it harmonizes), by the Synod of Dort in 1619; and again at the Hague in 1651.—*Tr.*]

(49) *Gerhard Brandt's* Historie der Reformatie in en omtrent de Nederlanden, vol. i., b. v., p. 253, &c.

(50) The words of *Brandt*, l. cit., p. 254, 255, are these: Nochtans behielpen sick de Nederlandtsche Gereformeerden met den titel van Augsburgsche Confessie, om dat die te hove met so onængenæm was als de Calvinsche of Fransche, die de partije doorgæns hield te wesen een oproeriger Secte dan de Luthersche.

(51) *Löscher's* Historia Motuum, pt. iii., lib. v., cap. iii., p. 36. *Salig's* Historie der Augsburg. Confession, vol. ii., b. vi., ch. iii., iv., v., p. 516. *Andr. Regenvolscius*, Historia Ecclesiar. Slavonicar., lib. i., cap. xvi., &c., p. 71, &c. *Solignac's* Histoire de Pologne, tom. v., p. 40, &c. *Nath. Fred. Kautz*, Præcipua relig. Evangelicæ in Polonia fata, Hamb., 1738, 4to. [The disciples

Hence there existed here and there throughout Poland, three sorts of religious associations, those of the Bohemian brethren, the Lutherans, and the Swiss. In order to oppose with greater vigour their common enemies, they held a convention at Sendomir in the year 1570, and entered into a kind of confederation, the terms of which are comprehended in a confession usually called the *Agreement of Sendomir*.(52) But as this compromise was deemed too condescending, and injurious to the truth, (for in it the opinions which separate the Lutherans from the Reformed, were expressed in vague and ambiguous language), it was not long after opposed by many of the Lutherans, and in the next century was entirely abrogated; nor have those who desired and laboured to restore it, to this day, met with the success they had hoped for. In both the [Brandenburg and the Polish] Prussias, after the death of *Luther* and *Melancthon*, very large congregations of the Reformed religion were gathered by certain persons, which still are in a flourishing state.(53)

§ 24. The *Bohemian brethren* as they are called, or the *Moravians*, who were descended from the better sort of Hussites, and had adopted some peculiar regulations designed especially to guard against the reigning vices, upon hearing of *Luther's* efforts to reform the church, sent envoys to him as early as 1522, soliciting his friendship; and afterwards, from time to time, they proffered the hand of friendship to the Saxons and to other members of our community. Nor did *Luther* and his friends find any thing very censurable, either in their doctrines or their discipline; nay, the confession which they submitted to his judgment, he did not indeed approve in all respects, yet he thought it might be tolerated.(54) After the death of Luther, most of the brethren being expelled their country in the year 1547,

of *Luther* from Saxony, were not the first preachers of reformation in Poland, as *Dr. Mosheim* asserts. The *Bohemian brethren* had been labouring there from the times of John Huss; and in the year 1500, they had nearly two hundred houses of worship, and were favoured by many of the nobility. See *A. Regenvolscius*, ubi supra; and *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref., vol. ii., p. 667, 681. The most eminent among the Reformed clergy of Poland, was the famous *John a Lasco*, who preached some time in London, and returning to Poland in 1556, did much to advance the reformation there. See his history and many of his letters, in *Dan. Gerdes*, Miscell. Groningens, tom. i.–v. The Protestants of Great Poland were chiefly Bohemian brethren: those of Little Poland embraced the views of the Swiss. Both these became united in 1555: but their union with the Lutherans was not so easily effected.— *Tr.*]

(52) See *Dan. Ern. Jablonsky's* Historia Consensus Sendomiriensis, Berlin, 1731, 4to, and his Epistola Apologetica, printed in the same year, and directed against the exceptions of a certain Polish antagonist.

(53) *Löscher's* Historia Motuum, pt. iii., lib. vi., cap. i., p. 216.

(54) See *Jo. Gottl. Carpzov's* Nachricht von den Bömischen Brüdern, p. 46, &c. *Jo. Christ. Köcher's* Bibliotheca theologiæ Symbolicæ, p. 76, &c. [In the year 1522, the Brethren sent two delegates to *Luther*, namely *John Horn* and *Mich. Weis*, to congratulate him on his attaining to a knowledge of the truth. They also sent him, soon afterwards, a book entitled Instruction for Children, which they had composed for the benefit of their church. But as they here expressed clearly their opinion of the Lord's supper, (namely, that Christ himself was not actually present in it), and he freely censured this opinion, their intercourse with *Luther* was for a time interrupted. They were also displeased, that he was more solicitous about purity of doctrine, than the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline. But as they perceived, that it would be for their advantage to be reckoned among the adherents to the Augsburg Confession, they at times sought his communion, and exhibited to him their Confession, which he afterwards caused to be published. See *Jo. Amos Comenius*, Historia Fratrum Bohemorum, Halle, 1702, 4to, p. 22, &c., and *Jo. Chr. Köcher*, von den Glaubensbekenntnissen der Bömischen Brüder, Frankf., 1741, 8vo.—*Schl.*]

many of them, and especially among those that settled in Poland, inclined towards the side of the Reformed. There seemed indeed to be a renewal of the harmony between the Bohemians and the Lutherans, at the time of the *Agreement of Sendomir* already mentioned; but the influence of this agreement was soon afterwards greatly weakened, and gradually all the Bohemians united themselves with the Swiss.(55) This union at first contained the stipulation, that each community should enjoy its own regulations, and that they should keep up their separate meetings for worship; but in the following century, at the councils of Ostrorog A.D. 1620 and 1627, all difference was done away; and the two communities of Bohemians and Swiss became consolidated into one, which took the name of the *Church of the United Brethren*, and retained the form and regulations of the Bohemians, but embraced the doctrines of the Reformed.(56)

§ 25. The descendants of the Waldenses who lived shut up in the vallies of Piedmont, were led by their proximity to the French and Genevans to embrace their doctrines and worship. Yet they retained not a few of their ancient rules of discipline, so late as the year 1630. But in this year the greatest part of the Waldenses were swept off by pestilence; and their new teachers, whom they obtained from France, regulated all their affairs according to the pattern of the French Reformed Church.(57) The Hungarians and Transylvanians were excited to burst the bonds of superstition, by the writings and the disciples of *Luther*. Afterwards *Matthew Devay* and others in a more private way, and then about the year 1550, *Stephen Szegedin* and others more openly, spread among them successfully the sentiments of the Swiss respecting the Lord's supper and the government of the church. This produced here, as in other countries,

(55) Besides those who treat professedly of the Bohemian Brethren, as *Comenius*, *Camerarius*, and *Lasitius*, the reader may consult *Löscher's* Historia Motuum, pt. iii., lib. v., c. vi., p. 99, &c. *Salig's* Historie der Augsburg. Confession, vol. ii., b. vi., ch. iii., p. 520, &c. *Adr. Regenvolscius*, Historia Ecclesiar. Slavonicarum, lib. i., cap. xiii., xiv., xv., &c.

(56) *Regenvolscius*, loc. cit., lib. i., cap. xiv., p. 120. [On the doctrinal views of the Bohemian Brethren, which coincided generally with those of *Calvin*, *Jo. Theoph. Elsner*, (one of that sect), wrote an elaborate treatise, entitled: Brevis Conspectus Doctrinæ Fratrum Bohemorum: in which he shows what was their belief in the 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries; and which is printed in *Dan. Gerdes'* Scrinium Antiquar. sive Miscellanea Groningana, tom. vi., p. 381–457.—*Tr.*]

(57) *Jo. Leger's* Histoire generale des Eglises Vaudoises, livre i., cap. xxxiii., p. 205, 206. *Abrah. Scultet's* Annales renovati Evangelii, p. 294. *Dan. Gerdes*, Historia Evangelii renovati, tom. ii., p. 401. [In the year 1530, the Waldenses having heard of the Reformation in Switzerland and Germany, sent two of their *barbs* or ministers, *Geo. Morel* and *Peter Masson*, or *Latome*, to Berne, Basle, and Strasburg, to confer with the reformers there. Their written communication to *Œcolampadius* at Basle, describes their faith and practice, with great simplicity and candour; and the written answer of *Œcolampadius* was such as might be expected, kind, affectionate, and fraternal. See them, in *Gerdes*, Hist. renovati Evangelii, tom. ii., p. 401–417. In their council in Angrogne, A.D. 1532, they adopted a short confession of faith, professedly embracing the doctrines they had firmly believed for four hundred years; yet manifestly a departure in some particulars, from the principles stated by their deputies to *Œcolampadius*; and conformed to the new views he had communicated to them, especially in regard to free-will, grace, predestination, and several points of practical religion. See this confession, in *J. P. Perrin's* History of the Waldenses, (Eng. translation), part i., b. ii., ch. iv., p. 59, &c. In the same council, they took measures to procure an impression of the whole Bible in their native language; and also a supply of other religious books. See *Perrin*, l. c., p. 61.—*Tr.*]

first, contests among the friends of a purer religion, and at length, a manifest schism, which time has strengthened rather than diminished.(58)

§ 26. After the promulgation of the Formula of Concord, many of the German churches which before belonged to the Lutheran communion, united themselves to the Reformed. Among these were the churches of Nassau, Hanau, Isenburg, and others. In the year 1595, the princes of Anhalt, at the instigation especially of *Wolfgang Amling*, embraced the Reformed worship in place of the Lutheran; which produced a long contest between the inhabitants of that principality and the Lutherans.(59) In Denmark also, near the close of the century, the Reformed doctrines especially in regard to the Lord's supper, gained some footing: for that kingdom abounded in disciples and admirers of *Melancthon*, who were disposed to promote peace among the Protestants, at the head of whom was *Nicholas Hemming*, a pious and learned divine of Copenhagen. But the designs of *Hemming* and his friends becoming known prematurely, the other divines who were unwilling to have Lutheranism set aside, opposed so many obstructions by means of the king, that those designs miscarried.(60)

§ 27. Moreover, the nations that held communion with the Swiss, did not embrace all the Helvetic tenets and institutions. The Swiss indeed ardently wished them to do so; but untoward circumstances frustrated their hopes. The English, as is well known, perseveringly rejected the ecclesiastical constitution and the form of worship adopted by the other Reformed churches; nor could they be persuaded to receive the common opinions of the Swiss respecting the Lord's supper and the divine decrees, as the public sentiments of the whole nation.(61) The churches of the

(58) *Paul Debrezen's* Historia ecclesiæ Reformatæ in Hungaria et Transylvania, lib. ii., p. 64, 72, 98, &c. Compare the Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1738, p. 1076, &c. *Geo. Haner's* Historia ecclesiar. Transylvanicarum, Frankf., 1694, 12mo. [See above, p. 49, note (62).—*Tr.*]

(59) *Jo. Christ. Bechman's* Historie des Hauses Anhalt, vol. ii., pt. vi., p. 133, &c. *Jo. Mich Kraft's* Ausführliche Historie von dem Exorcismo, p. 428, 497, &c. ["Though the princes professed Calvinism, and introduced Calvinist ministers in all the churches, where they had the right of patronage, yet the people were left free in their choice; and the noblemen and their vassals that were attached to Lutheranism, had secured to them the unrestrained exercise of their religion. By virtue of a convention made in 1679, the Lutherans were permitted to erect new churches. The Zerbst line, with the greatest part of its subjects, profess Lutheranism; but the three other lines with their respective territories, are Calvinists."—*Macl.*]

(60) *Eric Pontoppidan's* Annales ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomatici, tom. iii., p. 57, &c.

(61) ["It is true indeed, that the doctrine of *Zwingle*, who represented the bread and wine as nothing more than the external *signs* of the death of Christ, was not adopted by the church of England; but the doctrine of *Calvin* was embraced by that church, and is plainly taught in the thirty-eighth article of its faith. As to what relates to the doctrine of the divine decrees, *Dr. Mosheim* is equally mistaken. The seventeenth article of the church of England is, as bishop *Burnet* candidly acknowledges, framed according to *St. Augustine's* doctrine, which scarcely differs at all from that of *Calvin;* and, though it be expressed with a certain latitude that renders it susceptible of a mitigated interpretation, yet it is very probable, that those who penned it were patrons of the doctrine of absolute decrees. The very cautions, that are subjoined to this article, intimate that *Calvinism* was what it was meant to establish. It is certain, that the Calvinistical doctrine of predestination prevailed among the first English reformers, the greatest part of whom were, at least, *Sublapsarians;* in the reign of queen *Elizabeth*, this doctrine was predominant, but after that period it lost ground imperceptibly, and was renounced by the church of England in the reign of king *Charles* I. Some members of that church still adhered, nevertheless, to the tenets of Calvin, and maintained, not only that the thirty-nine articles were Calvinistical, but also affirmed, that they were not susceptible of being interpreted in that latitude for which the *Arminians* contended. These episcopal

Palatinate, Bremen, Poland, Hungary, and Holland, agreed indeed with the Swiss or French, respecting the Lord's supper, the simplicity of their worship, and the form of church government; but not likewise in respect to *predestination;* which difficult subject they left to the discretion of individuals.(62) And down to the time of the Synod of Dort, no portion of the Reformed community required, by any positive injunction, a belief in the opinion of the Genevans respecting the causes of everlasting salvation and damnation. Yet the greatest part of the teachers in most of these countries, gradually came spontaneously into the Genevan views, in consequence especially of the reputation and influence of the school of Geneva, to which most of the candidates for the ministry of that age were accustomed to resort for instruction.

§ 28. The inspired books of the Old and New Testaments, are held by the Reformed to be the only source of divine truth; except, that the English forbid contempt to be shown to the authority of the church in the five first centuries.(63) And they maintain, equally with the Lutherans, that these books are clear, full, and complete, so far as regards things necessary to salvation; and that they are to be interpreted from themselves, [or independently, and by comparing one part with another], and not after the dictates of human reason or of Christian antiquity. Several of their theologians, indeed, have been thought to extend too far the powers of human reason in comprehending and explaining the nature of the divine mysteries; and this has led many, to represent the Reformed as holding to *two* sources of religious knowledge, the holy scriptures, and reason or rather the capacity of the human mind. But in this matter, if we do not mistake the fact, both parties err through eagerness to vanquish and subdue their adversaries. For if we except the improper phraseology of certain individuals, it will appear that the Reformed in general believe, as we do, that absurdities can never be believed; and consequently, that doctrines which contain absolute absurdities, must be false and cannot be believed: yet they sometimes contentiously apply this principle to overthrow those Lutheran tenets which they reject.(64)

votaries of Calvinism were called *doctrinal Puritans*. See *Burnet's* Exposition of the seventh article, &c., and *Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. i., p. 579."—*Macl.* See also *A. M. Toplady's* History of Calvinism, 2 vols. 8vo. Bishop *Tomline's* Refutation of Calvinism, 8vo. *T. Scott's* remarks on Tomline on Calvinism, 8vo; and the Fathers, the Reformers, and the public Formularies of the church of England, in harmony with Calvin, &c., Philadelphia, 1817, 12mo, p. 108–119.—*Tr.*]

(62) See *Hugo Grotius*, Apologeticus eorum qui Hollandiæ ante mutationem, A.D. 1618, præfuerunt, cap. iii., p. 54, &c., ed. Paris, 1640, 12mo.

(63) ["There is nothing in the thirty-nine articles of the church of England, which implies, its considering the writings of the Fathers of the first five centuries, as an authoritative criterion of religious truth. There is indeed, a clause in the *Act of Uniformity*, passed in the reign of queen *Elizabeth*, declaring that her delegates, in ecclesiastical matters, should not determine anything to be heresy, but what was adjudged so *by the authority of Scripture or by the first four general councils;* and this has perhaps misled *Dr. Mosheim*, in the passage to which this note refers. Much respect indeed, and perhaps too much, has been paid to the Fathers; but that has been always a matter of *choice*, and not of *obligation*."—*Macl.* It was in regard to the constitution and government of the church, rather than in articles of faith, that the church of England paid more deference to the Fathers, than the rest of the Reformed did; and on this subject, they have actually copied after the practice of the first five centuries, as being obligatory upon the conscience. See sec. 20, p. 180, above; and *Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. i., ch. iv., p. 183, 184, ed. Portsm., 1816.—*Tr.*]

(64) ["Our author has here undoubtedly in view the Lutheran doctrine of *consubstantiation*, which supposes the same *extended*

§ 29. The Reformed, if we restrict this appellation to those who approve the sentiments of *Calvin*, differ from the Lutherans in regard to three subjects.—I. The doctrine of the holy supper: in which the Lutherans say, the body and blood of Christ are *truly*, though in an inexplicable manner, presented to both the pious and the ungodly; while the Reformed suppose, that the human nature of Christ is present only by the *symbols* of it. Yet they do not all explain their doctrine in the same manner.—II. The doctrine of the eternal decrees of God in regard to the salvation of men: the ground of which the Lutherans suppose to be, the faith or unbelief of men in Christ, foreseen by God from eternity; but the Reformed suppose it to be the free and sovereign good pleasure of God.—III. Certain rites and institutions: which, the Reformed think, have a tendency to superstition; but which, the Lutherans think, are partly sufferable, and partly useful to Christians. Such are images in churches, sacred garments for the clergy, the private confession of sins, the use of small circular pieces of bread [wafers], such as were anciently distributed in the holy supper, the formula of *exorcism* as it is called, in the sacrament of baptism; and some others. These, the Reformed would have to be abrogated; because they think religious worship should be restored to its primitive simplicity, and the additions made to it be wholly struck off.

§ 30. This short list of topics, will be seen to be in fact a long one, by those who are aware what a multitude of abstruse questions extending through the whole system of theology, these few differences produced. For the controversy respecting the mode of the presence of Christ's body and blood in the holy supper, afforded to the polemics ample room to expatiate on the mysteries of religion or the nature and use of the sacraments, and to institute subtile discussions respecting the majesty and glory of Christ's human nature, the communication of divine attributes to it, and the proper attitude of the mind in the worship of Christ. The dispute respecting the divine decrees afforded abundant matter for debate, on the nature of the divine attributes and particularly God's justice and goodness, on the certainty and necessity of all events, on the connexion between human liberty and divine providence, on the extent of the love which God has for men and of the blessings procured for us by the merits of Christ, on the nature of that divine influence which renews the minds of men, on the perseverance of the persons who are appointed to eternal life in the covenant of God; and on various other subjects of no small moment. Nor was the last dissension, respecting rites and institutions, unprolific. For besides discussions respecting the origin and antiquity of certain rites, it produced the following by no means contemptible controversies: What kind of things are they, which may be justly denominated indifferent, or neither good nor bad? How far is it proper, to yield to an adversary who contends about things in their nature indifferent? How far does Christian liberty extend? Is it lawful, for the sake of gratifying the people, to retain various ancient customs and institutions, which have a superstitious aspect yet are capable of a good interpretation? and others of a similar nature.

§ 31. It has been debated, and sometimes with great warmth of feeling, particularly among the English and the Dutch, to whom rightfully belongs

body to be totally present *in different places*, at one and the same time. To call this a gross and glaring contradiction, seems rather the dictate of common sense, than the suggestion of a contentious spirit."—*Macl.*]

the government of the church, and the power of establishing rules and regulations in matters of religion. In these contests, those have come off victorious, who maintain that the authority to regulate sacred affairs is, by the appointment of Christ himself, vested in the church, and therefore ought by no means to be committed into the hands of civil magistrates; yet they admit the right of temporal sovereigns to advise, and to succour the church when in trouble, to assemble and preside in the conventions of the church, to see that her officers decree nothing prejudicial to the commonwealth, and to strengthen and confirm with their authority the decrees of the ministers of religion. The kings of England indeed, from the time of *Henry* VIII., have declared themselves to be supreme *heads of the church, as well in spiritual as in temporal things:* and it is manifest, that *Henry* VIII. and his son *Edward* VI. attached very ample powers to this title, and considered themselves authorized to do whatever the Roman pontiffs might do.(65) But queen *Elizabeth* greatly limited this prerogative, and declared that the authority of the kings of England did not extend to *religion* itself, and to things sacred, but only to the *persons* who teach religion and minister in sacred things.(66) In England therefore the con-

(65) *Daniel Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. i., chap. i., p. 11, and others.

(66) *Peter Fran. le Courayer's* Supplement aux deux Ouvrages pour la defense de la validité des Ordinations Anglicanes, cap. xv., p. 416, &c. [*Courayer's* book, I have not seen; but, in what respects queen *Elizabeth* limited the powers of the kings of England as supreme heads of the church, or when and where, she declared, that the regal power did not extend to *religion itself* and to *things sacred*, I am unable to determine. *Burnet* indeed, (Hist. of the Reform., vol. iii., p. 492, ed. London, 1825), says of the power conferred on *Elizabeth* at the commencement of her reign by the act of supremacy: "It was in many things short of the authority that king *Henry* had *claimed*." But he specifies no particulars; and it is well known, that Henry far transgressed the limits which he pretended to set to his own power as head of the church. *Neal* says of the power given to *Elizabeth* by the above act of her parliament; "Nor is it the whole that the queen claimed, who sometimes stretched her prerogative beyond it." (Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i., ch. iv., p. 168, ed. Portsm., 1816.) *Hume* says of this act, (Hist. of England, vol iv, ch. xxxviii., p. 151, ed. Philad., 1810), "Though the queen was there denominated *governess*, not *head*, of the church, it conveyed the *same* extensive power, which, under the latter title, had been exercised by her father and brother." And he adds (ibid., p. 274), "Scarcely any sovereign before *Elizabeth*, and none after her, carried higher, both in speculation and practice, the authority of the crown." He likewise says, (p. 290), "Religion was a point, of which *Elizabeth* was, if possible, still more jealous, than of matters of state. She pretended that, in quality of supreme head or governor of the church, she was fully empowered, by her prerogative alone, to decide all questions which might arise, with regard to *doctrine*, *discipline*, or *worship*; and she never would allow her parliaments so much as to take these points into consideration." And the whole history of her reign appears to confirm these statements, which are so contrary to the assertions of *Dr. Mosheim*. See *Hume*, loc. cit., vol. iv., p. 150, &c., 272, 290, &c., 292, 336, 364, &c., 462.—The powers of the English monarchs, as heads of the church, from *Henry* VIII. to *Charles* I., are thus defined, by Mr. *Neal*, in his Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i., ch. iv., p. 169–172. "They never pretended to be *spiritual persons*; or to exercise any part of the ecclesiastical function, in their own person; they neither preached, nor administered the sacraments," &c. "But, abating this point, it appears very probable, that all the jurisdiction and authority, claimed by the pope, as the head of the church,—was transferred to the king, by the act of supremacy,—as far as was consistent with the laws of the land then in being; though since, it has undergone some abatements." He then proceeds to the following specifications. "I. The kings and queens of England claimed authority in matters of *faith*, and to be the ultimate judges of what is agreeable or repugnant to the word of God." "II. With regard to *discipline*,—the king is the supreme and ultimate judge in the spiritual courts by his delegates, as he is in the courts of common law by his judges." "III. As to rites and *ceremonies*, the Act of Uniformity (1 Eliz., cap. i.) says expressly, *that the queen's majesty, by advice of her ecclesiastical com-*

stitution of the church, is very nearly the same as that of the state. The clergy, distributed into two houses called the upper and lower houses of *Convocation*, are assembled by the order of the king and a summons from the archbishop of Canterbury; and they decree by common consent whatever the interests of the church are thought to demand; and the king and Parliament give to their decrees the sanctions and authority of laws.(67) Yet this subject has been much controverted; the king and the Parliament putting one construction upon the ecclesiastical constitution, and the rulers of the church, particularly those who think the church is an independent body, giving a different construction of it. And in fact, the ecclesiastical constitution of England has not a fixed and uniform character, but it depends on custom and usage and the fluctuations of time, rather than on established laws.

§ 32. The question, what is the best form and organization of a Christian church, produced likewise warm contests, which hitherto no means have been found able to decide. The Genevans, guided by *Calvin*, judged it proper that the private affairs of single churches should be directed by a body of elders or *presbyters*, all equals; that matters of a more public and important character, should be decided in conventions of delegated elders in the provinces; and that the interests of the whole church, and matters of special difficulty, should be discussed, as anciently, in a council of the whole church.(68) Nor did the Genevans omit any exertions to

missioners, or of her metropolitan, may ordain and publish such ceremonies or rites, as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, and the edifying of the church. Accordingly, her majesty published her injunctions, without sending them into convocation or parliament, and erected a court of *High Commission*, for ecclesiastical causes, consisting of commissioners of her own nomination, to see them put in execution. Nay, so jealous was queen *Elizabeth* of this branch of her prerogative, that she would not suffer her high court of parliament to pass any bill for the amendment or alteration of the ceremonies of the church, it being (as she said) an invasion of her prerogative." "IV. The kings of England claimed the sole power of the nomination of bishops; and the deans and chapters were obliged to choose those whom their majesties named, under penalty of a *præmunire*; and after they were chosen and consecrated, they might not act, but by commission from the crown." "V. No *convocation*, or synods of the clergy, can assemble, but by a writ or precept from the crown; and when assembled, they can do no business, without the king's letters patents, appointing them *the particular subjects* they are to debate upon; and after all, their canons are of no force without the royal sanction." "Upon the whole it is evident, by the express words of several statutes, (31 Hen. VIII., cap. xvii., 1 Eliz., c. i.), that *all jurisdiction, ecclesiastical as well as civil*, was vested in the king, and taken away from the bishops, except by delegation from him. The king was chief in the determination of all causes in the church; he had authority to make laws, ceremonies, and constitutions, and without him no such laws, ceremonies, or constitutions, are, or ought to be of force. And *lastly*, all appeals, which before had been made to *Rome*, are for ever hereafter to be made to his majesty's chancery, to be ended and determined, as the manner now is, by delegates."—*Tr.*]

(67) *Jo. Cosin*, de ecclesiæ Anglicanæ religione et disciplina, cap. viii., p. 53: in *Thomas Smith's* Vitæ eruditiss. virorum, London, 1700, 4to. *David Wilkins*, de vet. et mod. Synodi Anglic. constitutione; in his concil. Mag. Brit., tom. i., p. vii., &c.

(68) [*Dr. Maclaine* thinks *Dr. Mosheim* has here made a great mistake, in specifying *three* judicatories as provided by the Genevan plan; while in fact the Genevan republic had but two ecclesiastical bodies, the *Venerable Company* of the pastors and professors, and the *Consistory*. But there is no need of severe criticism. The *Presbyterian* system is simply this, that single churches should each have a judicatory, composed of all the elders belonging to it; that this judicatory be responsible to one or more higher judicatories, composed of delegated elders: and that the highest judicatory be, that of a national synod, constituted in the same manner. Where the state is very small, as that of Geneva, there would be but one delegated body, in which each

persuade all their confederates to embrace this system. But the English judged the old system of church government, to be very sacred, and therefore not to be changed: this system commits the inspection and care of certain minor provinces exclusively to the bishop; under the bishops are the presbyters of single churches; under the presbyters are the ministers or deacons; and the common interests of the whole body are discussed in assemblies of the bishops and those next in rank to them. And this system, with some exceptions, is adopted by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, who belong to the Reformed church.(69) This single disagreement, as each party traced the origin of its own system to *Jesus Christ* and his apostles, was sufficient to divide up the whole Reformed church into sects: and, in fact, it rent the English church into two factions, to the great injury of the community. But, in contravention of the wishes of many, the prudence of certain excellent individuals prevented the evil from spreading abroad, and destroying the fellowship of foreigners with the English. These men disseminated the principle, that *Jesus Christ* prescribed no definite form of government for his church; and therefore that every nation may frame such a system for itself, as the circumstances of the country require, provided it be not prejudicial to the truth nor tend to the restoration of superstition.(70)

§ 33. *Calvin* believed, that such as led vicious and ungodly lives, ought to be deprived of communion in divine ordinances; and that profligates

individual church would be represented. But in larger states, as France, Holland, and Scotland, there would be a gradation of three or four distinct judicatories, each higher composed of delegates from the next lower. In France, there were, (1) Consistories, or church sessions, (2) the Elderships or Presbyteries, (3) the provincial councils, and (4) the national Synods; all formed on this plan. In Scotland, originally, the lowest judicatory was that of three or four contiguous churches united, then the provincial synods, and last the General Assembly. But, at an early period, each church came to have its distinct session; and this produced a gradation of *four* judicatories in Scotland. —But while the Reformed admitted of no higher judicatory than a national council, or considered the church of each country as an independent body, they allowed of a connexion between national churches. Thus the national synods of the French church, in this century, held a continued correspondence by letters and envoys, with the church of Geneva; and also regularly sent representatives to the Reformed church of the low countries; and received delegates from them. And in the next century, the Reformed Dutch church invited the Reformed churches of France, Germany, England, &c, to assist them, by their representatives, in the national synod of Dort. So at the present day, in the United States of America, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church annually exchanges delegates with the General Associations of the New-England States; and also holds correspondence with some transatlantic bodies.—*Tr.*]

(69) See the Epistola de Ordinatione et successione Episcopali in unitate fratrum Bohemorum conservata; in *Christ. Matth. Pfaff's* Institutt. Juris Eccles., p. 410.

(70) Here may be consulted with advantage, the discussions on the subject between *Fred. Spanheim* and *John van der Waeyen*, in the works of *Spanheim*, tom. ii., lib. viii., ix., p. 1055, &c. The same opinion is said to have been embraced by the British divines who lived near the times of the Reformation; and to have been first repudiated by *John Whitgift*. *Daniel Neal*, History of the Puritans, vol. iii., p. 140. [This statement is incorrect, as respects bishop *Whitgift*. Mr. *Neal* says, (vol. iii., p. 156, ed Portsmouth, 1817), "Most of our first reformers were so far in these sentiments," (those of the *Erastians*), "as to maintain, that no one form of church government is prescribed in scripture, as an invariable rule for future ages; as *Cranmer*, *Redmayn*, *Cox*, &c., and archbishop *Whitgift*, in his controversy with *Cartwright*, delivers the same opinion: "*I deny* (says he) *that the scripture has set down any one certain form of church government to be perpetual.*" "The chief patrons of this scheme in the (Wetsminster) Assembly, were *Dr. Lightfoot*, *Mr. Colman*, *Mr. Sel-*

and the slaves of lust were also to be restrained by the laws of the state. In this matter he differed from *Zwingle*, who ascribed all power to the magistrates alone, and would not allow to the ministers of religion the right to exclude transgressors from the church, or to deprive them of the communion.(71) And so great was the influence of *Calvin* at Geneva, that he was able, though with great perils and amid perpetual conflicts with the patrons of licentiousness, to establish there a rigorous system of moral discipline, supported and exercised with the countenance of the laws; whereby abandoned characters were first excluded from the church by the ecclesiastical court or the *Consistory*, and then were either banished the city or restrained by other punishments.(72) The clergy in the cantons of Switzerland, wished to copy after this discipline of *Calvin*, and to obtain the same power over transgressors; but their desires and efforts were in vain. For the people in the cantons of Bern, Zurich, Basle, &c., would by no means allow a removal of the boundaries set by *Zwingle* to the jurisdiction of the church, or permit the enlargement of its powers and prerogatives.(73)

§ 34. That all branches of learning both sacred and profane, were every where successfully cultivated, among the Reformed in this century, is well known; and the numerous monuments of their splendid geniuses, which are still preserved, forbid any one to be ignorant of the fact. *Zwingle* was disposed to exclude philosophy from the church:(74) but the succeeding Swiss doctors soon discovered, that in such a world as this, and especially in the disputes on religious subjects, a knowledge of it cannot be dispensed with. Hence, when *Calvin* erected the academy of Geneva in 1558, he at once provided for it a professor of philosophy. But this professor was required to explain in his lectures none but the Aristotelian philosophy, which then reigned in all the schools.(75) Nor did the other universities

der, Mr. Whitlock; and in the house of commons, besides *Selden* and *Whitlock*, *Oliver St. John*, Esq.; Sir *Thomas Widrington*; *John Crew*, Esq.; Sir *John Hipsley*, and others of the greatest names."--*Tr.*]

(71) See the excellent letter of *Rud. Gualther*, in *Jo. Conrad Fueslin's* Centuria i. Epistolar. a Reformator. Helvet. scriptar., p. 478, where he says: Excommunicationem neque Zwinglius—neque Bullingerus unquam probarunt, et—obstiterunt iis qui eam aliquando voluerunt introducere.—Basiliæ quidem Œcolampadius, multum dissuadente Zwinglio, instituerat—sed adeo non durabilis fuit illa constitutio, ut Œcolampadius illam abrogarit, &c. Compare p. 90.

(72) Nothing caused *Calvin* more troubles, cabals and perils, at Geneva, than his determined resolution to purge the church of transgressors, and to restrain and punish such as violated the rules established by the church, or by the *Consistory* which represented the church. See his Life, written by *Beza*, and prefixed to his Letters; the Notes to the second volume of *Jac. Spon's* Histoire de Geneve; and *Calvin* himself, in his Letters, especially in those which he wrote to *James de Falais* or *De Bourgogne*, published at Amsterdam, 1744, 8vo, p 126, 127, 132, 153, 157. The party at Geneva, which defended the former licentiousness of morals, not only with their tongues but by their actions and with force of arms, and which *Calvin* called the sect of the *Libertines*, was very powerful. But *Calvin's* resolution was also invincible, and his rigorous discipline triumphed.

(73) See, for example, the commotions at Lausanne; in the Museum Helveticum, tom. ii, p. 119, &c. The disputes on this subject among the people of the Palatinate, who wished to adopt the Genevan discipline, are described by *Henry Alting*, in his Hist. Eccles. Palatina; and by *Struve*, in his Pfälzischen Kirchenhist., p. 212, &c.

(74) *Zwingle*, in the dedication of his book on true and false religion to *Francis* I. king of France, says expressly, on p. 12, Philosophiæ interdictum est a Christi scholis: at isti (the Sorbonists) fecerunt eam cœlestis verbi magistram.

(75) *Theodore Beza's* Epist Theolog., ep. xxxvi., p. 156. Certum nobis ac constitutum est, et in ipsis tradendis Logicis et in cete-

of the Reformed, suffer a different philosophy to be taught in them. Yet at Basle, the system of *Peter Ramus*, for a time, was by some preferred to that of Aristotle.(76)

§ 35. The Reformed church, from its very commencement, had many expositors of the Scriptures, several of whom were ingenious and excellent. *Zwingle's* labours in explanation of most of the books of the New Testament, are not to be despised. He was followed by *Henry Bullinger*, *John Œcolampadius*, *Wolfgang Musculus*, and many others, not his equals indeed in genius and learning, yet all of them meriting some praise. But the first rank among the interpreters of this age, is deservedly assigned to *John Calvin*, who endeavoured to expound nearly the whole of the sacred volume; and to *Theodore Beza*, whose New Testament, illustrated with learned remarks of various kinds, especially critical ones, has been often published, and has not to this day lost all the renown and estimation in which it was formerly held. It is an honour to most of these expositors, that disregarding allegories and mystical interpretations, they endeavour to ascertain the literal import of the language used by the inspired men: but on the other hand some of them, and in particular *Calvin*, have been reproached, because they venture to refer to Jewish affairs, some predictions of the ancient prophets which relate to *Jesus Christ* and represent him as present to their view; and thus have deprived Christianity of important corroboration.(77)

§ 36. The state of dogmatic theology among the Swiss and the other Reformed, was much the same as it was among the Lutherans. *Zwingle* early collected and digested the principal doctrines of Christianity, in his little book on *true and false Religion*. Afterwards, *John Calvin* produced a much larger and more perfect work of this sort, entitled *Institutes of the Christian Religion;* which long held the same rank and authority in nearly all countries of the Reformed church, as *Melancthon's* Commonplace Book (Loci Communes) did among the Lutherans. *Calvin* was succeeded by many writers on dogmatic theology, some more prolix and others more concise; as *Musculus*, *Peter Martyr*, *Piscator*, and others. The earlier the writer in this department, the less he has of subtility and philosophical discrimination; and in this they resemble *Calvin*, whose *Institutes* are written in a perspicuous and elegant style, and have nothing abstruse and difficult to be comprehended in the arguments or mode of reasoning. But after a while, the Aristotelico-Scholastic philosophy which was every where inculcated, invaded also the fields of theology; and it rendered them barren, thorny, and frightful, by means of its barbarous terms, its captious interrogatories, its tenuous distinctions, and its rubbish of useless matter.(78)

ris explicandis disciplinis, ab Aristotelis sententia ne tantillum quidem deflectere.

(76) See *Casper Brant's* Vita Jacobi Arminii; and the notes we formerly annexed to it, p. 8, 12, 13.

(77) See *Ægid. Hunnius*, Calvinus Judaizans, Wittemberg, 1595. 8vo; to which *David Pareus* opposed his Calvinus Orthodoxus. Neostadii, 1595. 8vo. [Even the Catholics have done *Calvin* the justice, to rank him among the good commentators. *Richard Simon*, in his Histoire crit. du Vieux Test., p. 434, places him above *Luther*, as to discrimination and soundness of judgment; though he ascribes to *Luther* more knowledge of the Hebrew. He adds: Au reste, Calvin aiant l'esprit fort elevé, on trouve dans tous ses Commentaires sur l'Ecriture un je ne-scai-quoi qui plait d'abord, et comme il s'étoit principalement appliqué à connoître l'homme, il a rempli ses Livres d'une Morale qui touche.—*Schl.*]

§ 37. Their instructions for regulating the life and conduct, are annexed for the most part, by the Reformed theologians of this age, to their doctrines of faith: which was according to the example of *Calvin*, whom they nearly all follow as their guide. For he, in the last chapter but one of his *Institutes*, treats of the civil power or the *government of the state;* and in the last chapter, of the *life and conduct of a Christian:* but he is less full, than the importance and copiousness of the subject demand. Those in other respects excellent men, were prevented from labouring to elucidate and systematize this branch of sacred knowledge, by the same causes that diverted our theologians from it; and especially by the tumult of perpetual controversy. It is conceded by eminent divines among the Reformed, that *William Perkins*, an Englishman,(79) first undertook to explain in a more accurate manner the science of practical theology; which *Calvin* and his contemporaries had left in a rude and imperfect state. With him was associated, among the Hollanders *William Teling*,(80) who wrote however

(78) Yet what is called the *scholastic* mode of treating theology, appears to have pervaded the Reformed church, somewhat later than it did our church. At least, it was quite recent in Holland, at the time of the council of Dort, [A. D. 1619.] In this council, *John Maccovius* a professor at Franeker who was initiated in all the mysteries of the philosophic schools, was accused by *Sibr. Lubbert*, of corrupting the truths of revelation. The case being investigated, the judges decided, that *Maccovius* had not indeed perverted Christian doctrines, but that he employed a mode of teaching of less simplicity than was proper; for he followed rather the example of the Scholastic doctors, than that of the Holy Spirit. We will give the decision of the council, in the language of *Walter Balcanquall*, in his epistle to Sir *Dudley Carleton*, (which is the 350th of the Epistolæ Ecclesiasticæ, published by *Phil. Limborch*, p. 574.) Maccovium—nullius hæreseos reum teneri—peccasse eum, quod quibusdam ambiguis et obscuris Scholasticis phrasibus usus sit: *quod Scholasticum docendi modum coneturin Belgicis Academiis introducere.* —Monendum esse eum, ut cum Spiritu Sancto loquatur, non cum Bellarmino et Suarezio. *Maccovius* did not obey these admonitions; as is manifest from his writings, which are full of scholastic wit and knotty discussions. He therefore, seems to have first taught the Dutch to philosophize on revealed religion. Yet he had associates, as *William Ames*, and others. And it must be true, that this philosophic or scholastic form of theology was extensively prevalent among the Reformed, anterior to the synod of Dort, if that be true, which *Simon Episcopius* states in his last oration to his disciples at Leyden; namely, that he had studiously avoided it, and had thereby incurred the violent hatred of the other doctors. He says, (in *Phil. Limborch's* Life of Episcopius, p. 123), Videbam veritatem multarum et maximarum rerum in ipsa Scriptura sacra, elaboratis humana industria phrasibus, ingeniosis vocabularum fictionibus, locorum communium artificiosis texturis, exquisitis terminorum ac formularum inventionibus adeo involutam, perplexam, et intricatam redditam esse, ut Œdipo sæpe opus esset ad Sphingem illam Theologicam enodandam. Ita est, et hinc primæ lacrymæ. And, a little after, p. 124, he adds: Reducendam itaque terminorum Apostolicorum et cuivis obviorum simplicitatem semper sequendam putavi, et sequestrandas, quas Academiæ et Scholæ tanquam proprias sibi vindicant, Logicas, philosophicasque speculationes et dictiones.

(79) [*William Perkins* was born in 1558, educated at Cambridge, where he became fellow of his college and also a parish priest. He died in 1602, aged 44. In early life, he was profane, prodigal, and given to intemperance; but when reformed, he became eminent for piety and an exemplary life. He was a Puritan, and as such repeatedly persecuted; was strictly Calvinistic, a very popular and faithful preacher, and a voluminous writer. His works, which were printed at Geneva, 1603, in 3 vols. fol., have been much read and admired on the Continent. See *Brook's* lives of the Puritans, vol. ii., p. 129, &c. His chief works on practical theology, are *Anatomy of the human Conscience; On the right way of living and dying; On the nature of repentance*, &c.—*Tr.*]

(80) [*Teling* died in 1629, at Haarlem, where he was a preacher. His practical writings bear the marks of that age, and generally have allegorical titles; e. g., *The pole star of genuine piety.* At this

in the Dutch language. In emulation of them, *William Ames*, an Englishman,(81) but a theologian of Franeker in Holland, undertook to compose a complete system of *Practical Theology*.(82) Afterwards, others prosecuted the subject.

§ 38. There did not arise in this century, so many sects and religious contests among the Reformed, as there were among us: which, while they may esteem it much to their credit, may be easily traced to adequate causes, by one acquainted with the history of the Reformed church.(83) Yet *John Calvin* mentions and confutes one very pernicious faction, which was far worse than any of ours; namely, the sect of the *Libertines* or the *Spirituals*; which originated from *Anthony Pockes*, *Gerhard Ruff*, *Quintin*, and others its leaders and founders, in Flanders; and thence passed into France, where it obtained countenance, from *Margaret*, the queen of Navarre and sister of *Francis* I., and found patrons likewise in other sections of the Reformed church.(84) These *Spirituals*, if we carefully consider all that *Calvin* and others have written against them, not always with suf-

day, they are useful only in the history of practical theology.—*Schl.*]

(81) [In the original, *Dr. Ames* is called a *Scotchman*. So palpable an error, is corrected without scruple, in the translation. He was born in the county of Norfolk, England, in the year 1576; educated at Cambridge, under *Mr. Perkins*; became fellow of his college; was a zealous Puritan, and persecuted in 1610. He fled into Holland; preached a while in the English church at the Hague; was made professor of divinity at Franeker; resigned the office at the end of 12 years, on account of his health; and retired to Rotterdam, where he died in 1633, aged 57. His widow and children removed to New-England; to which he had intended to remove. He was learned, acute, soundly Calvinistic, and a strict Independent. His writings are numerous, chiefly polemic and doctrinal, and written in a clear, concise, and nervous Latin style. See *Middleton's* Biographia Evangelica, vol. iii., p. 45, &c., and *Brook's* Lives of the Puritans, vol. ii., p. 405, &c.—*Tr.*]

(82) See the Dedication and Preface to *William Ames'* formerly very famous work, *de Conscientia et ejus jure*. In page 3 of the Preface, among other things, he says: Quod hæc pars prophetiæ (i. e., practical theology), hactenus minus fuerit exculta, hoc inde fuit, quod primipilares nostri perpetuo in acie adversus hostes pugnare, fidem propugnare et aream ecclesiæ purgare, necessitate quodam cogebantur, ita ut agros et vineas plantare et rigare non potuerint ex voto, sicut bello fervente usu venire solet. His *Exhortation*, addressed to the theological students at Franeker, and subjoined to the above work, is worthy of perusal. From this address we may learn among other things, that in the universities of the Reformed, the chief attention was then bestowed on dogmatic and polemic theology; and that practical theology lay neglected: Theologi præclare se instructos putant ad omnes officii sui partes, si dogmata tantum intelligant.—Neque tamen omnia dogmata scrutantur, sed illa sola, quæ precipue solent agitari et in controversiam vocari.

(83) [*Dr. Maclaine* says here: "*Dr. Mosheim* ought to have given us a hint of his manner of accounting for this, to avoid the suspicion of having been somewhat at a loss for a *favourable* solution." *Schlegel* therefore subjoins the following: "The Reformed church was at first small, and more closely knit together, than the Lutheran; and of course there could not arise in it such wide spreading contentions. The leading persons also were able so to temper their disagreements, that they could not break out into a great flame. *Zwingle* and *Calvin* were men of great influence, who could arrest all contentions with as much power, as *Luther* could. But *Melancthon*, who succeeded *Luther*, had not such influence; and when he was dead, there was no one to be found in our church, competent to extinguish the fire, which, during his lifetime, had been smoking in the ashes." A better solution may be found, I think, in the *spirit* and the religious *principles* of the two communities. For in the English church, which most resembled the Lutheran in these respects, there was as violent and as pernicious contention, as among the Lutherans. —*Tr.*]

(84) See *Calvin's* Instructio adversus fanaticam et furiosam sectam Libertinorum, qui se Spirituales vocant; in his Tractatus Theologici, p. 599, &c.

ficient perspicuity, (for I do not know, that any of their own writings are extant,) maintained; that God himself works all things in all men, or is the cause and author of all human actions; that therefore, the common notions of a difference between good actions and bad, are false and vain; that men cannot, properly speaking, commit sin; that religion consists in the union of the rational soul or the spirit, with God; that if a person attains to this, by contemplation and directing his mind upward, he may freely obey the instincts of his nature; for, whatever he may do, he will be innocent, and after death will be united to God. These doctrines are so similar to the views of the ancient *Beghards* or *Brethren of the Free Spirit*, that I have very little doubt, these *Spirituals* were their descendants: and the fact, that this sect originated in *Flanders*, which in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was full of this sort of people, corroborates the supposition.

§ 39. Totally different in character from these *Spiritual Libertines*, though not unfrequently confounded with them, were those *Libertines* of Geneva, with whom *John Calvin* had to contend fiercely all his life. The latter were no other than citizens of Geneva, who could not endure *Calvin's* rigorous discipline; and who, in opposition to his regulations, defended with craft and violence, with factions, insults and abuse, the dissolute morals of their progenitors, their brothels and carousals, their sports and frolics; all of which, as well as other indications of an irreligious spirit, *Calvin* most severely condemned and chastised.(85) There were moreover in this turbulent faction, persons not only dissolute in their lives, but also scoffers and despisers of all religion. Such a character was *James Gruet*; who not only assailed *Calvin* with all his power, and called him *bishop of Ascoli*(86) and *the new pope*, but also discarded and opposed the divinity of the Christian religion, the immortality of the soul, the distinction between right and wrong, and whatever else was most sacred in the view of Christians; and for this, he was punished capitally, in the year 1550.(87)

§ 40. *Calvin* had also at Geneva controversies with some, who could not digest his doctrines and especially his gloomy doctrine of absolute decrees. Being a man of excessive ardour, and too jealous of his own reputation, he would not suffer them to reside at Geneva: nay, in the heat of controversy yielding to his passions, he frequently accused them of crimes and enormities, from which they have been acquitted by the judgment of posterity.(88) Among these was *Sebastian Castalio*, master of the public school at Geneva; a man not indeed free from all faults, yet honest, and distinguished for erudition and the elegance of his genius. As he would not praise all that *Calvin* and his colleagues did and taught, and especially as he rejected *Calvin's* and *Beza's* doctrine of pure and absolute predesti-

(85) See *Jac. Spon's* Histoire de Geneve, tom. ii., p. 44, in the notes of the editor.

(86) [The import of this title of reproach, or the ground of its pertinence in the view of *Gruet*, is not explained by the historians who mention it; nor was *Schlegel* able satisfactorily to account for it. See his long note.—*Tr.*]

(87) See *Spon*, loc. cit., tome ii., p. 47, the note.

(88) We may venture to say this at the present day, since the Genevans themselves and other doctors of the Reformed church, ingenuously confess, that the great talents of *Calvin* were attended by no small defects of character; which however, they think should be overlooked, on account of his extraordinary merits. See the notes to *Spon's* Histoire de Geneve, tome ii., p. 110, &c., and elsewhere; also the Preface to the Lettres de Calvin à Jaques de Bourgogne, p. xix., &c.

nation, he was required in 1544, to resign his office and go into exile. But the authorities of Basle received the exile, and gave him the Greek professorship in their university.(89)

§ 41. Similar was the fate of *Jerome Bolsec*, a French Carmelite monk, but greatly inferior to *Castalio* in learning and genius. He came to Geneva, allured by the reformation to which he was inclined, and there established himself as a physician. But in the year 1551, he most imprudently declaimed with vehemence in a public assembly, against the doctrine of God's absolute decrees. For this he was cast into prison, and at last was compelled to leave the city. He returned to his native country, and to the Romish religion which he had before renounced; and now he assailed the reputation and the life and conduct of *Calvin*, and likewise of his colleague *Beza*, in the most slanderous publications.(90) From *Bolsec's* calamity, originated the enmity between *Calvin* and *James of Burgundy*; an illustrious descendant from the dukes of Burgundy, and a great patron and intimate friend of *Calvin*, who had been led by his attachment to him to fix his residence at Geneva. *James* employed *Bolsec* as his personal physician; and therefore supported him all he could, when borne down by the influence of *Calvin*, to prevent his being entirely prostrated. This so exasperated *Calvin*, that, to avoid his resentments, *James* thought proper to retire from Geneva into the country.(91)

§ 42. *Bernardin Ochin*, an Italian of Sienna, and formerly vicar general of the order of Capuchins, a man of a fecund and discriminating mind, who preached to an Italian congregation at Zurich, was, in the year 1563, condemned and ordered into exile, by the decision of the whole Reformed church of Switzerland. For, in his books which were numerous, among other opinions differing from the common views, he taught in particular, that the law respecting the marriage of a single wife, was not in all cases without some exceptions. His works show, that he speculated on many subjects more boldly than that age would permit, and in a different manner from the Swiss theologians. Yet there are those who maintain, that his errors at the time when being old, and indigent, he was compelled to forsake Switzerland, were not so great as to deserve to be punished with banishment. He retired into Poland, and there united with the Antitrinitarians and Anabaptists; and died in the year 1564.(92)

(89) See *Jac. Uytenbogard's* Ecclesiastical History, written in Dutch, pt. ii., p. 70–73; where he endeavours to evince the innocence of *Castalio*; *Bayle's* Dictionnaire, tome i., p. 792, &c. [article *Castalion*; which is elaborate, and appears to be candid.—*Tr.*] *Paul Colomesius*, Italia Orientalis, p. 99, and others. [See. *Jo. Conrad Füssli's* Lebensgeschichte Seb. Castellio, Frankfort and Lipsic, 1774, 8vo.—*Schl.* *Castalio* was born in Dauphiny or Savoy, 1515, and spent his days at Strasburg, Geneva, and Basle; where he died in 1563. He was an elegant Latin and Greek scholar; and wrote much, particularly translations into Latin and French. His Latin translation of the Bible, is his most important work. He denied unconditional election; considered the Canticles as an uninspired book; and rejected *Calvin's* opinion respecting Christ's descent into hell. These were his chief errors.—*Tr.*]

(90) See *Bayle's* Dictionnaire, article *Bolsec*, tome i., p. 592. *Jac. Spon's* Histoire de Geneve, the note, tome ii., p. 55. Bibliotheque raisonnée, tome xxxii., p. 446, and tome xxxvi., p. 409.

(91) See the Lettres de Calvin à Jacques de Bourgogne, Preface, p. viii., &c. Bibliotheque raisonnée, tome xxxii., p. 444, and tome xxxiv., p 406.

(92) *Zach. Boverius*, Annales Capucinorum; and from these Annals, the author of the book entitled: La guerre Seraphique, ou Histoire des perils qu' a couru la barbe des Capucins, livr. ii., p. 147, livr iii., p. 192, 230, &c. Observationes Halenses Latinæ, tom. iv., observ. xx., p. 406, tom.

§ 43. While the Reformed punished with so great severity the audacity of those who conceived some change was requisite in the prevailing doctrines, they believed that the greatest mildness and gentleness were to be manifested, in those most violent contests between the English *Puritans* and *Episcopalians*. For while they were particularly attached to the *Puritans*, who contended for the doctrines and discipline of the Swiss; they still regarded the *Episcopalians* with brotherly affection, and urged their confederates the Puritans, to do the same; notwithstanding the Episcopalians injured most sensibly the greater part of the Reformed community, and by proclaiming the divine origin of their own discipline, scarcely allowed to the Reformed the name and the prerogatives of a true church. This moderation resulted from prudence, and from the fear of offending a high-spirited and prosperous nation, and its most powerful queen whose influence governed even Holland also; and finally, from the danger of a destructive schism among the Reformed. For indeed, it is one thing to coerce and to cast out feeble and unarmed individuals, who are disposed to disturb the peace of a city by advancing opinions, not perhaps absolutely absurd nor of dangerous tendency, yet really novel; and quite another thing, to provoke and drive to a secession, a noble and most flourishing church, which may be defective in some respects. Moreover the ground of the dissension [in England] hitherto, did not seem to be religion itself; but the external forms of religion, and the constitution of the church. Yet soon afterwards, some of the great principles of religion itself were brought under discussion.(93)

§ 44. No one can deny or be ignorant of the fact, that the Reformed church in this age abounded in very eminent men, who were distinguished for their acquisitions of knowledge both human and divine. Besides *Ulric Zwingle*, *John Calvin*, and *Theodore Beza*, men of inexhaustible genius; the following have acquired by their writings, immortal praise; namely, *John Œcolampadius*, *Henry Bullinger*, *William Farell*, *Peter Viret*, *Peter Martyr*, *Theodore Bibliander*, *Wolfgang Musculus*, *Conrad Pellican*, *Lewis Lavatar*, *Rudolph Hospinian*, *Zacharias Ursinus*, *Thomas Cranmer*, archbishop of Canterbury, *Stephen Szegedinus*, and many others; whose names and merits may be learned from the common writers of literary history, especially from *Melchior Adam*, *Anthony Wood*, *Gerard Brandt*, *Daniel Neal*, an Englishman, the very learned and industrious author of the History of the Puritans, and from other writers.(94)

v., observ. i., p. 3, &c. *Bayle's* Dictionnaire, tome iii., p. 2105. *Christ. Sand's* Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar., p. 4, &c. *Niceron*, Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Hommes illustres, tome xix., p. 166, &c. [See the sketch of his life, above, p. 77, near the end of note (10).—*Tr.*]

(93) [The sarcasms of *Dr. Mosheim* in this section, against the Reformed, do him no honour. The note of *Dr. Maclaine*, however, is worth inserting. It is this: "All the Protestant divines of the *Reformed* church, whether Puritans or others, seemed indeed, hitherto, of one mind about the *doctrines of faith*. But, towards the latter end of queen *Elizabeth's* reign, there arose a party, which were first for softening, and then for overthrowing, the received opinions concerning *predestination*, *perseverance*, *free-will*, *effectual grace*, and the *extent of Christ's redemption*. These are the doctrines to which *Dr. Mosheim* alludes in this passage. The clergy of the episcopal church began to lean towards the notions concerning these intricate points, which *Arminius* propagated some time after this: while, on the other hand, the Puritans adhered rigorously to the system of *Calvin*. Several episcopal doctors remained attached to the same system, and all these abettors of Calvinism, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian, were called *doctrinal Puritans*."—*Tr.*]

(94) [All the larger biographical dictionaries may be consulted; and also the En-

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THE SECT OF ANABAPTISTS OR MENNONITES.

§ 1. Origin of the Anabaptists, obscure.—§ 2, 3. Their probable Origin.—§ 4. Their first Movements.—§ 5. Their Progress.—§ 6. Punishments decreed them.—§ 7. Those of Munster.—§ 8. Menno Simonis.—§ 9. His Doctrine.—§ 10. Origin of Sects among the Anabaptists.—§ 11. The more gross, and the more refined.—§ 12. Source of the Mennonite Religion.—§ 13. It was late reduced to a System.—§ 14. What it is.—§ 15. The first Principle of their common Doctrines.—§ 16. Their Doctrines themselves.—§ 17. Their practical Doctrines.—§ 18. Singular Doctrines of certain Sects.—§ 19. Their Learning and Erudition.—§ 20. Many Sects among them.—§ 21. Permanent Seat of the Mennonites first in Holland.—§ 22. The English Anabaptists.—§ 23. General and particular, what their Views.—§ 24. David George.—§ 25. Henry Nicolai. The Familists.

§ 1. The origin of the sect, who from their repetition of the baptism received in other communities, are called *Anabaptists*,(1) but who are also

cyclopædias, particularly that of *Dr. Rees*. To these may be added, *Middleton's* Bioraphia Evangelica, and *Brook's* Lives of the Puritans; besides the numerous biographies of individual men. The means of becoming acquainted with the lives, characters, and writings of distinguished modern theologians, are so abundant, and the extent of the subject so great, that full lists of all the authors of each century, will not be given in the notes to the centuries in this volume, as in those prior to the reformation.—*Tr.*]

(1) The modern *Mennonites* are offended with this term, and profess to be entirely free from the practice of repeating *baptism*, on which this name is founded. They admit, that the old *Anabaptists* had the custom of rebaptizing such as joined them from other denominations of Christians; but they say, the custom at this day is laid aside by much the greater part of their community. See *Herman Schyn's* Historiæ Mennonitarum plenior Deductio, cap. ii., p. 32. But, unless I am altogether deceived, these good men here lose sight of that simplicity and ingenuousness, which they at times so highly recommend; and artfully conceal the true ground of this appellation. They pretend, that their predecessors were called *Anabaptists*, for this reason, that they thought those, who had been baptized in other communities after they became adults and attained to the full use of reason, were to be baptized again. But it is certain that the name was given to them, not only for that reason, but more especially, because they considered the persons who were initiated into the Christian church by baptism in their infancy, as not belonging to the church at all; and therefore when such persons would join the *Anabaptists*, they baptized them a second time. And in this sentiment all the sects of *Anabaptists* continue quite to the present time, however much they may differ in other opinions and customs. Among the ancient *Anabaptists*, those in particular who are called *Flemings* or *Flandrians*, most fully merit this appellation. For they rebaptize, not only those who received baptism in other denominations in their childhood or infancy, but likewise such as received it in adult years. Nay, each particular sect of *Anabaptists*, rebaptizes those who come to them from the other sects of their denomination: for each sect considers its own baptism to be the only true and valid baptism. The *more moderate* Anabaptists, or the *Waterlandians* as they are called, are a little wiser; because they do not rebaptize such as were baptized at adult years, in other denominations; nor those who were baptized in other sects of Anabaptists. And yet they are justly denominated *Anabaptists*, because they rebaptize those who received baptism in their infancy. Still however the patrons of the sect most carefully keep this custom out of sight; because they are afraid, lest the almost extinguished odium should revive, and the modern *Mennonites* be regarded as descended from the flagitious *Anabaptists*, if they should frankly state the facts as they are. Hear a very recent writer, *Schyn*, (loc. cit., p. 32), where he en-

denominated *Mennonites*, from the celebrated man to whom they owe a large share of their present prosperity, is involved in much obscurity.(2) For they suddenly started up, in various countries of Europe, under the in-

deavours to show, that his brethren are unjustly stigmatized with the odious name of *Anabaptists:* Anabaptismus ille, (says he), plane obsolevit, et a multis retro annis neminem cujuscunque sectæ Christianæ fidei *juxta mandatum Christi* baptizatum, dum ad nostras ecclesias transire cupit, rebaptizaverunt, i. e., *That Anabaptism has become wholly obsolete; and for many years past, no person of any sect whatever, that holds the Christian faith, if baptized* ACCORDING TO THE COMMAND OF CHRIST, *when he wishes to join our churches, is rebaptized.* On reading this, who would not readily suppose that the repetition of baptism no longer exists among the Mennonites of our times? But the fallacy is in some measure betrayed, by the words which we have printed in capital letters: *according to the command of Christ.* For the *Anabaptists* contend, that it is without any command of Christ, that infants are admitted to baptism. And the whole design is more clearly indicated, by the words which follow: sed illum etiam ADULTORUM baptismum, ut sufficientem agnoscunt. And yet, as if he had fully established his point, *Schyn* thus concludes his argument; Quare verissimum est, illud odiosum nomen Anabaptistarum illis non convenire. But it does certainly belong to them; because the very best of the *Mennonites*, equally with those from whom they are descended, think that the baptism of infants has no validity; and therefore they cause those who have already been baptized among other Christians, to be again baptized with their baptism.—There are many things which induce me to believe, that reliance cannot always be placed on the *Confessions* and the expositions of the modern *Mennonites*. Being instructed by the miseries and sufferings of their fathers, they conceal entirely those principles of their sect, from which their character and state would most clearly appear; and the others, which they cannot conceal, they most studiously disguise, that they may not appear too bad. —[This long and invidious note of *Dr. Mosheim*, the translator would gladly have omitted, if he had felt himself at liberty to suppress any thing contained in the book. For to what purpose are such discussions? The point at issue is, whether the *Mennonites* or Baptists, are properly denominated *Anabaptists*. And the fact is, that according to their own principles, they *are not*, in the literal and proper sense of the word, *Anabaptists* or *Rebaptizers*. But according to the principles of all believers in infant baptism, they *are*, literally and truly, *Anabaptists*. For they hold infant baptism to be no valid Christian baptism; and therefore to be consistent, when they receive to their church one who had been baptized in infancy, they must give him baptism; for he is, on their principles, an *unbaptized* person. But according to the believers in infant baptism, such a person had previously received a real, Christian baptism; and therefore to baptize him now, is to *rebaptize* him. Such being the true state of the case, is not *Dr. Mosheim's* eagerness to fasten on the *Mennonites* the odious name of Anabaptists, as good proof—to say the least—of disingenuousness, as is their eagerness to get rid of it? He if successfu., gains nothing; except to render them odious. They are striving to have a fair trial of their case, solely upon its merits; without being exposed to the prejudice of words and names.—*Tr.*]

(2) The writers who treat of the *Anabaptists*, and who confute them, are enumerated at large, by *Casp. Sagittarius*, Introductio ad Historiam Eccles., tom. i., p. 826, &c., and by *Chr. Matth. Pfaff*, Introduct. in Histor. litterariam Theol., part ii., p. 349, &c. To their lists must be added, the very recent writer and doctor among the Mennonites, *Herman Schyn;* who first published his Historia Mennonitarium, Amsterd., 1723, 8vo, and afterwards his Historiæ Mennonitarum plenior Deductio, Amsterd., 1729, 8vo. Both the works will aid in acquiring a knowledge of the affairs of this sect; but neither of them deserves the title of a History of the Mennonites. For the writer deems it more his business, to defend and justify his sect, than to give a regular narrative of their origin, progress, and revolutions. Yet he does not perform the functions of a vindicator, so learnedly and judiciously, that the Mennonites could not have a better patron. Of the historians and Confessions of the Mennonites, *Jo. Christ. Köcher* treats expressly, in his Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolicæ, p. 461, &c. [The principal English histories of baptism and of the Baptists or Mennonites, are *Wm. Wall's* Hist of Infant Baptism, 2 vols. 8vo, Lond., 1705; his Defence of the History; and *Gale's* Reflections on Wall's history: *Thomas Crosby's* Hist. of the Baptists, 4 vols. 8vo, 1739. *Robert Robinson's* Hist. of Baptism, Lond., 1790, 4to, abridged by *D. Benedict*, Boston, 1817, 8vo, and *David Benedict's* General Hist. of the Baptists, Boston, 1813, 2 vols. 8vo.—*Tr.*]

fluence of leaders of dissimilar characters and views; and at a time when the first contests with the Catholics so distracted the attention of all, that they scarcely noticed any other passing occurrences. The modern *Mennonites* affirm, that their predecessors were the descendants of those *Waldenses*, who were oppressed by the tyranny of the papists; and that they were a most pure offspring, and most averse from any inclinations towards sedition, as well as from all fanatical views.(3) On the contrary, their adversaries contend, that they are descended from those turbulent and furious *Anabaptists*, who in the sixteenth century involved Germany, Holland, Switzerland, and especially Westphalia, in so many calamities and civil wars; but that being terrified by the dreadful fate of their associates, through the influence of *Menno Simonis* especially, they have gradually assumed a more sober character. After duly examining the whole subject, with impartiality, I conceive that neither statement is altogether true.

§ 2. In the first place, I believe the *Mennonites* are not altogether in the wrong, when they boast of a descent from those Waldensians, Petrobrusians, and others, who are usually styled *the Witnesses for the truth* before Luther. Prior to the age of *Luther*, there lay concealed in almost every country of Europe, but especially in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland, and Germany, very many persons, in whose minds was deeply rooted that principle which the Waldensians, the Wickliffites, and the Hussites maintained, some more covertly and others more openly; namely, that the kingdom which Christ set up on the earth, or the visible church, is an assembly of *holy* persons; and ought therefore to be entirely free not only from ungodly persons and sinners, but from all institutions of human device against ungodliness. This principle lay at the foundation and was the source of all that was new and singular in the religion of the *Mennonites:* and the greatest part of their singular opinions, as is well attested, were approved some centuries before *Luther's* time, by those who had such views of the nature of the church of Christ.(4) Some of this class of people, perceiving

(3) *Galenus Abrahamzon's* Verdediging der Christenen, die doopsgesinde genand worden, p. 29. *Herman Schyn's* plenior Deductio Histor. Mennonit., cap. i., p. 2, &c.

(4) As respects the Waldensians, see *Philip a Limborch's* Historia Inquisitionis, lib. i., cap. viii., p. 37. ["See also *Lydii* Waldensia, and *Allix's* Ancient churches of Piedmont, ch. xxii.–xxvi., p. 211–280. N."—*Mucl.*] That the Wickliffites and Hussites were not far from the same sentiments, can be shown by adequate testimony. [That the *Mennonites*, as being one of those Protestant sects which renounced the Romish religion in the 16th century, resembled very much the Waldenses, the Wickliffites, and the Hussites, those earlier revolters from the Romish worship, is undoubtedly true. And it may therefore be justly said, that "the greatest part of their singular opinions," —meaning those in which they differed from the *Romish* church,—"were approved, some centuries before *Luther's* time." And this, I think, must be all that *Dr. Mosheim* intended to say. For, that in most of the points in which they appeared singular among *Protestants*, they bore a nearer resemblance to the proper Waldenses, the Wickliffites, and the Hussites, than the other Protestants or than the Lutherans and the Reformed did, is very far from being true. On the contrary, it is a well-known historic fact, that in the 16th century the genuine descendants of the old Waldensians, Wickliffites, and Hussites, who were numerous in France, England, Bohemia, Moravia, &c., readily united with the Lutheran and the Reformed communities, and at length became absorbed in them; and that very few, if any of them, ever manifested a preference for the *Mennonites*, or for any of the Anti-pædobaptist sects of that age. The History of the Reformation in all the countries where the ancient sects were found, fully establishes this fact; which is so adverse to the supposition of a legitimate descent of the *Mennonites* from the pure Waldensians. The first *Mennonites* were not persons who had before borne the name of Waldensians,

that such a church as they had formed an idea of, would never be established by human means, indulged the hope that God himself would in his own time erect for himself a new church, free from every blemish and impurity; and that he would raise up certain persons, and fill them with heavenly light for the accomplishment of this great object. Others, more discreet, looked for neither miracles nor inspiration; but judged that the church might be purified from all the contaminations of evil men, and be brought into the state that Christ had intended, by human efforts and care, provided the practice and the regulations of the ancient Christians were restored to their pristine dignity and influence.

§ 3. The spirits and courage of this people, who had long been severely persecuted and scattered over many countries, revived, as soon as they heard that *Luther*, aided by many good men, was successfully engaged in reforming the very corrupt state of the church. According to their different principles and views, some supposed that the time was now come, when God himself would take possession of men's hearts and would set up his heavenly kingdom on the earth; others concluded, that the long-expected and wished for restitution of the church, to be effected indeed under the providence of God but yet by human agency, was now at hand. With these, as is common in such great revolutions, were joined many every where, of similar aims but of unlike capacities; who in a short time, by their discourses, their dreams, and their prophecies, roused up a large part of Europe, and drew over to the party a vast multitude of the ignorant and ill-informed people. The leaders of this great multitude, erroneously conceiving that the new kingdom which they foretold was to be free from all evils and imperfections, because they considered the reformation of the church which *Luther* had commenced as not corresponding with the magnitude of the case, projected themselves a more perfect reformation of it, or rather, projected another and altogether a divine church.

§ 4. Whether the origin of this discordant sect which caused such mischief in both the civil and religious community, is to be sought for in Switzer-

or who were known descendants of Waldensians; nor did they originate either in or near the countries where the Waldensians in that age resided. And if we endeavour to trace the history of that grand peculiarity of all *Mennonites*, their confining baptism to adult believers and rejecting infant baptisms altogether, we shall find, that at the time *Menno* first embraced it, it existed among the numerous German Anabaptists, but not among the Waldenses of France or Bohemia, who were then universally believers in infant baptism and were in fraternal communion with the Lutheran and Reformed churches. These Waldensian Pædobaptists moreover, declared that they held the same belief which their fathers had maintained for several centuries; and they appealed to their old books, to make good their assertions. See *Jo. Paul Perrin's* History of the Waldenses, pt. i, b. i., ch. iv., p. 15, of the Eng. translation: and pt. iii., b. iii., iv., p. 99. Nor does ecclesiastical history appear to me, to disprove the truth of their assertion. There were indeed various mystical sects, tinctured more or less with Manichæan views, in the twelfth and following centuries, who rejected all water-baptism, on much the same grounds as the Quakers still do: (vol. ii., p. 265, &c., above), and some of these assailed infant baptism especially, as being peculiarly unsuitable and absurd. There is also pretty good evidence, that early in the 12th century, *Peter Bruis* and his successor *Henry*, with their followers the *Petrobrussians* and *Henricians*, did at first reject infant baptism, without discarding all baptism. (See vol. ii., p. 267, and the notes there.) But soon after, *Peter Waldo* arose, and gave birth to the proper Waldensians; and we hear no more of the Petrobrussians and Henricians. They probably gave up their opposition to infant-baptism. See *Wall's* Hist. of Infant Baptism, pt. ii., ch. vii.—*Tr.*]

land, or in Holland and Germany, or in some other country, it is not important to know, and is impossible fully to determine.(5) In my opinion, this only can be affirmed, that at one and the same time, that is, not long after the commencement of the reformation by Luther, there arose men of this sort, in several different countries. This may be inferred from the fact, that the first leaders of any note among the *Anabaptists* were, nearly all, founders of distinct sects. For though all these reformers of the church, or rather these projectors of new churches, are called *Anabaptists*, because they all denied that infants are proper subjects of baptism, and solemnly baptized over again those who had been baptized in infancy; yet from the very beginning, just as at the present day, they were split into various parties which disagreed and disputed about points of no small importance. The worst part of this motley tribe, namely, that which supposed the founders of their ideal and perfect church would be endued with divine powers and would work miracles, began to raise great disturbances in Saxony and the neighbouring countries, in the year 1521, under the guidance of *Thomas Munzer*, *Mark Stubner*, *Nicholas Storck*, and other chiefs. They first pursued their object by means of harangues, argumentations, and the detail of divine visions, to which the leaders of their party made pretensions. But finding these means less efficient than they could wish, and that their influence was resisted by the arguments of *Luther* and others, they rushed to arms. *Munzer* and his associates, having collected a vast army from among the credulous populace, particularly in the rural parts of Suabia, Thuringia, Franconia, and Saxony, proclaimed war in the year 1525, against all law and civil governments, and declared that *Christ* alone would reign from that time forward. But these forces were routed without much difficulty, by the elector of Saxony and other princes; *Munzer*, the firebrand of sedition, was put to death, and his aiders and abettors were dispersed.(6)

§ 5. By this bloody defeat, the others who were actuated by the same turbulent and fanatical spirit, were rendered indeed more timid, but not more wise. It appears that from this time onward, there roamed about Germany, Switzerland, and Holland, many persons infected with the same criminal principles which had proved the ruin of *Munzer;* that in many places they disturbed both the church and the state, by their seditious discourses; that they gathered here and there larger or smaller congregations; and in the name of God, announced sudden destruction as about to overtake the magistrates and the civil governments; and while they pretended to be ambassadors of God, often audaciously insulted the divine majesty, by their shameful conduct and crimes. Infamous with posterity beyond others of this senseless tribe, were the names of *Lewis Hetzer*, *Balthazar Hubmeyer*, *Felix Mantz*, *Conrad Grebel*, *Melchior Hoffmann*, *George Jacobs*, and others; who would, if their abilities had been adequate, have involved all Switzerland, Holland, and Germany, in tumults

(5) Whether the *Anabaptists* appeared first in Germany, or in Switzerland, is made the subject of inquiry, by *Jo Conrad Fuslin*, Beyträge zur Schweizerischen Reformationgeschichte, tom. i., p. 190, tom. ii., p. 64, 65, p. 265, 327, 328, tom. iii., p. 323. But he is not self-consistent in the discussion, nor has he accomplished any thing.

(6) See *Ludov. a Seckendorf's* Historia Lutheranismi, lib. i., p. 192, 304, &c., lib. ii, p. 13 *Jo. Sleidan*, Commentarii, lib. v., p. 47. *Joach. Camerarius*, Vita Melanchonis, p. 44, &c.

and wars.(7) Among these people there were some strangely delirious, and who fancied they had incredible visions: but those of them who were not destitute of all rationality, taught for substance the following doctrines. I. That the church of Christ ought to be free from all sin. II. That a community of goods, and universal equality, should be introduced. III. That all usury, tithes, and tributes, were to be abolished. IV. That the

(7) See the details collected, among others by *Jo. Baptist Ottius*, in his Annales Anabaptistici, p. 21, &c., by *Jo. Hornbeck*, Summa Controversiarum, lib. v., p. 332. *Anth. Mattheus*, Analecta vet. ævi, tom. iv., p. 629, 677, 679, the recent ed., *Bernhard Raupach's* Austria Evangelica, tom. ii., p. 41. *Jo. Geo. Schelhorn*, Acta ad Historiam Eccles. pertinentia, tom. i., p. 100. *Godfrey Arnold*, Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, book xvi, ch. xxi., p. 727, &c. *Jo. Conrad Füslin*, in the various documents relating to the Anabaptists, which he has inserted in his Beyträge zu der Schweitzerischen Reformations-Geschichte: [and more recently, Professor *Wills*, Beyträge zur Geschichte des Anabaptismus in Deutschland nebst wichtigen Urkunden und Beylagen, Nuremb., 1773, 8vo.—Lewis Haetzer, whom some take to be a Bavarian, and others a Swiss, was a man of abilities; and well versed especially in the languages. *Joachim Vadianus* (see *Füslin*, vol. v., p. 397) calls him: Commodissimi ingenii hominem, clarum virum, linguis etiam et admirabili ingenii dexteritate præditum. He lived in the time of the Reformation at Zurich, and aided the Reformers by his discourses and his writings; among other things, he translated *Œcolampadius'* book de Sacramento Eucharistiæ, into German, in the year 1526. But he afterwards separated from the Reformers, and followed his own views in theology, which were often singular; as appears from his writings published between the years 1523 and 1529. Among other works, he translated the prophets, with the assistance of *Hans Denk*. He also wrote in the year 1523, a book against the divinity of Christ; which *Ambrose Blarer*, by direction of *Zwingle*, confuted. He was among the extravagant Anabaptists; and was beheaded at Constance in 1529, because he cohabited with many women, and perverted the scriptures to justify his unchastity.—Balthazar Hubmeyer, who sometimes called himself *Friedberger*, from his native place in Bavaria, is, in the above-cited epistle of *Joach. Vadianus*, pronounced, eloquentissimus, and humanissimus vir. Before the Reformation, he was for a time preacher in the principal church at Regensberg; where he became suspected, on account of some erroneous doctrines, and was obliged to quit the place. Afterwards he preached at Waldshut. But as he allowed himself to be led astray by *Thomas Münzer*, he was driven from that place also; and fleeing to Zurich, he was thrown into prison; but after a three days' discussion with *Zwingle*, he recanted. Yet continuing afterwards enthusiastic, he was expelled the city, and retired to Moravia, where he fell into the hands of the Austrian government, and was burned alive at Vienna, in 1528. His writings are enumerated by *Füslin*, Beyträge, vol. v., p. 399, &c.—Felix Manz, of Zurich, was there apprehended, with others, on account of his Anabaptistic doctrines, and was drowned. See *Füslin*, Beyträge, vol. v., p. 259, &c.—Grebel was also of Zurich, of a good family, and of great talents; but of so great obstinacy, that nothing could induce him to change his opinions. Yet he fortunately escaped from prison, and afterwards died a natural death.—Melchior Hoffmann was a furrier of Suabia, who laboured to disseminate the doctrines of the Anabaptists in the Netherlands, and in lower Saxony and Livonia; and died in prison at Strasburg, in 1533. To enumerate his writings here, would be tedious.—Jacobi is called in the documents, (see *Füslin's* Beyträge, vol. v., p. 265). Georg vom Hause Jacobs, genant Blaurock von Chur. He was twice apprehended at Zurich, was beaten with rods, and, after twice swearing to keep the peace, was banished the country.—To the preceding, may be added John Denk, who once taught in the school of St. Sebald, at Nuremberg; but after his connexion with the Anabaptists, he resided chiefly at Basle and at Worms. He taught also the *restoration of all things*; and aided *Hetzer*, as already stated, in his translation of the prophets; which was published at Worms, 1527, folio. His smaller pieces were printed a second time, Amsterdam, 1680, 12mo. Several extracts are given by *Arnold*; Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, part iv, section ii., No. 31, p. 530, &c. See also Dr. *Büttinghausen's* Beyträge zur Pfälzischen Geschichte, part iii., p. 299, whence we learn that *Denk* recanted before he died; and that his recantation was published, probably by *Œcolampadius*.—*Schl.*]

baptism of infants was an invention of the devil. V. That all Christians had a right to act as teachers. VI. That of course, the Christian church had no need of ministers or teachers. VII. Neither was there any need of magistrates, under the reign of Christ. VIII. That God still made known his will, to certain persons, by dreams and visions.(8) I omit other opinions. It would however betray ignorance or want of candour, to deny that there were others every where, who held in general to the same opinions yet lived more quietly and peaceably, and in whom no great fault can be found, except their erroneous opinions and their zeal to disseminate them among the people. Nor do I fear to add, that among the followers not only of these more sober Anabaptists but even of those altogether misguided, there were many persons of honest intentions and of real piety, whom an unsuspecting simplicity and a laudable desire to reform the church, had led to join the party.

§ 6. While this tumultuous sect was spreading itself through nearly all Europe, the emperors, kings, princes, and magistrates resisted them with very severe edicts, and at last with capital punishments.(9) But here also the maxim was fully verified, which long experience has proved true, that the human mind, when either agitated by fanatical fury or strongly bound by the cords of religion, is not easily cured by terrors and dangers. Vast numbers of these people in nearly all the countries of Europe, would rather perish miserably by drowning, hanging, burning, or decapitation, than renounce the opinions they had embraced. And therefore the Mennonites at this day show us ponderous volumes, filled with the accounts of the lives and sufferings of those of their party, who expiated by their death the crimes they were supposed to have committed against either the church or the state.(10) I could wish there had been some distinction made; and that all who believed that adults only are to be baptized, and that the ungodly are to be expelled the church, had not been indiscriminately put to death. For they did not all suffer on account of their *crimes*, but many of them merely for the erroneous *opinions*, which they maintained honestly and without fraud or crime. Yet most of them talked out among the people, their dreams of a new church of Christ about to be set up, and of the impending abolition of all magistracies, laws, and punishments: and hence the very name of *Anabaptist* presented at once before the mind, the idea of a seditious person, that is, one who was a public pest. It is indeed true, that many *Anabaptists* were put to death, not as being bad citizens or injurious members of civil society, but as being *incurable heretics* who were condemned by the old canon laws: for the error concerning adult baptism or *Catabaptism* and *Anabaptism*, was in that age looked upon as a

(8) These are chiefly collected from the documents published by *Füslin*. [Whether they also denied the divinity of Christ, and justified polygamy. *Fuslin* examines, in the third volume of his Beyträge, p. 119; and evinces by documents, that they did not.—*Schl.*]

(9) If I do not mistake, it was first in Saxony and in the year 1525, that laws were enacted against this sort of people. And these laws were frequently renewed, in the years 1527, 1528, and 1534. See *Jo. Erh. Kapp's* Nachlese von Reformations-Urkunden, pt. i., p. 176. As the impudence of many of this sect became more bold, *Charles* V. published severe decrees against them, in 1527 and 1529. *Ottii* Annales Anabaptist., p. 45. The Swiss at first proceeded very gently against their Anabaptists; but when many of them became more bold in consequence of this lenity, the canton of Zurich in the year 1525, suspended over them capital punishment.

(10) See *Joach. Christ. Jehring's* Preface to his Historie der Mennoniten, p. 3, &c.

horrible offence. But it is also true, that very many were put to death for holding opinions dangerous to the republic and to the civil authorities; and numbers likewise suffered for their temerity, their imprudences, and their criminal deeds.

§ 7. A shocking example of this, is visible in the case of those Anabaptists from Holland, who came to Munster a city of Westphalia, in the year 1533, and there committed deeds which would be scarcely credible, were they not so well attested as to compel belief. These infatuated men, whose brains were turned by that dream of a new kingdom of Christ about to be erected on the earth, which bewildered the great body of Anabaptists, having for leaders certain illiterate and plebeian men, e. g., *John Matthæi*, *John Bockold* a taylor of Leyden, one *Gerhard*, and some others, persuaded not only the common people but likewise some of the religious teachers, that their blessed heavenly Jerusalem was about to be established at Munster, and would thence be extended to other places. Under this pretext, they deposed the magistrates, took command of the city, and ventured upon all the criminal and ridiculous measures which their perverse ingenuity could devise.(11) *John Bockold* was created king and lawgiver to this celestial republic. But the issue of the scene was tragical and distressing. For after a long siege, the city being captured in 1536 by its bishop, *Francis count Waldec*, who was also its temporal lord, this New Jerusalem of the Anabaptists was destroyed, and its king punished with the utmost severity.(12) From these and other events of a similar character which occurred about this time in various places,(13) it was but too

(11) ["*Bockholdt*, or *Bockelson*, alias *John* of Leyden, who headed them at Munster, ran stark naked in the streets, married eleven wives, at the same time, to show his approbation of polygamy, and entitled himself *King of Sion*; all which was but a very small part of the pernicious follies of this mock-monarch."—*Macl.*]

(12) *Anton. Corvini* Narratio de miserabili Monaster. Anabapt. excidio; first published, Wittemb., 1536, and then elsewhere: and the other writers mentioned by *Casper Sagittarius*, Introd. in Historiam Eccles., tom. i., p. 537 and 835. Add *Herm. Hamelmann's* Historia renati Evangelii in urbe Monasterii; in his Opera Genealogico-Historica, p. 1203, &c. The elegant and accurately written Latin elegiac poem of *Jo. Fabricius Boland*, entitled: Motus Monasteriensis Libri decem, Cologne 1546, 8vo. *Herm. Kerssenbrock's* Historia belli Monasteriensis; published by *Dan. Gerdes*, Miscellan. Groningens. nova, tome ii., p. 377. *Gerdes* also treats (ibid., tom. ii., p. 403) of *Bernhard Rohtmann*, a minister of the gospel at Munster, a man in other respects neither of a bad character nor unlearned, who joined with these Anabaptists, and aided them in their mad projects.

(13) ["The scenes of violence, tumult, and sedition, that were exhibited in Holland by this odious tribe, were also terrible. They formed the design of reducing the city of *Leyden* to ashes, but were happily prevented and severely punished. *John* of Leyden, the anabaptist king of Munster, had taken it into his head that God had made him a present of the cities of *Amsterdam*, *Deventer*, and *Wesel*; in consequence thereof, he sent bishops to these three places, to preach *his* gospel of sedition and carnage. About the beginning of the year 1535, twelve Anabaptists, of whom five were women, assembled at midnight in a private house at *Amsterdam*. One of them, who was a tailor by profession, fell into a trance, and after having preached and prayed for the space of four hours, stripped himself naked, threw his clothes into the fire, and commanded all the assembly to do the same, in which he was obeyed without the least reluctance. He then ordered them to follow him through the streets *in this state of nature*, which they accordingly did, howling and bawling out, *Wo! wo! the wrath of God! the wrath of God! wo to Babylon!* When, after being seized and brought before the magistrates, clothes were offered them to cover their indecency, they refused them obstinately, and cried aloud, *We are the naked truth!* When they were brought to the scaffold, they sung and danced, and discovered all the marks of enthusiastic phrensy. These tumults were

manifest whither the principles of this school would lead unstable and incautious men; and hence it is not strange that the magistrates were eager to extirpate the roots of such mischief with fire and sword.(14)

§ 8. When this miserable sect was in the utmost consternation, partly from the extinction of all their hopes from the men of Munster, and partly from anxiety about their personal safety, while they saw the best as well as the worst among them daily hurried away to certain execution; great consolation and relief were afforded them, by *Menno Simonis* of Friesland, who was once a popish priest, and as he himself confesses a debauched character. He first covertly and secretly united with the Anabaptists; but afterwards in the year 1536, quitting the sacred office he had hitherto held among the papists, he openly espoused their cause. And now in the year 1537, he listened to the entreaties of several of these people,—whom he describes as sober, pious persons, that had taken no part in the criminal transactions at Munster, but who as others believe, had been associates of the Westphalian rabble, but had become wiser by the calamities of their brethren,—and consented to assume the functions of a religious teacher among them. From this period to the end of his days or for about five-and-twenty years, he travelled with his wife and children, amid perpetual sufferings and daily perils of his life, over very many regions of country,—first in West Friesland, the territory of Groningen, and East Friesland, and then in Gelderland, Holland, Brabant, Westphalia, and the German provinces along the shores of the Baltic as far as Livonia,—and in this way he gathered an immense number of followers, so that he may justly be considered as almost the common father and bishop of all the Anabaptists, and as the founder of the flourishing sect that has continued down to our times. The causes of this so great success may readily be conceived, if we consider the manners and the spirit of the man, and the condition of the party at the time he joined them. *Menno* possessed genius, though not much cultivated, as his writings evince; and a natural eloquence. Of learning he had just enough to be esteemed very learned and almost an oracle, by the raw and undiscerning multitude. Moreover, if we may judge from his words and actions, he was a man of integrity, mild, accommodating, laborious, patient of injuries, and so ardent in his piety as to exemplify in his own life, the precepts which he gave to others. A man of such a character would readily obtain followers among any people; but among none more readily than among such as the Anabaptists then were, a people simple, ignorant of all learning, accustomed to teachers that raved and howled rather than instructed them, very often deluded by impostors, worn out with perpetual suffering, and now in constant peril of their lives.(15)

followed by a regular and deep-laid conspiracy, formed by *Van Geelen* (an envoy of the mock-king of Munster, who had made a very considerable number of proselytes) against the magistrates of Amsterdam, with a design to wrest the government of that city out of their hands. This incendiary marched his fanatical troop to the town-house on the day appointed, drums beating, and colours flying, and fixed there his head-quarters. He was attacked by the burghers, assisted by some regular troops, and headed by several of the burgomasters of the city. After an obstinate resistance he was surrounded with his whole troop, who were put to death in the severest and most dreadful manner, to serve as examples to the other branches of the sect, who were exciting commotions of a like nature in *Friesland, Groningen*, and other provinces and cities in the *Netherlands*."—*Mael.*]

(14) *Gerh. Brandt's* History of the Reformation in Belgium, tom. i., lib. ii., p. 119. &c.

(15) *Menno* was born, not as many say in 1496, but in 1505, and at Witmarsum,

§ 9. *Menno* had struck out a system of doctrine, which was much milder and more tolerable than that of the furious and fanatical portion of the

a village near Bolswert in Friesland. After being variously tossed about during his whole life, he died in 1561, in the duchy of Holstein, on an estate situated not far from Oldesloe, and belonging to a nobleman, who was touched with compassion for the man exposed now to continual plots, and who received both him and his associates under his protection and afforded him an asylum. An account of *Menno* has been carefully drawn up by *Jo. Möller;* in his Cimbria Litterata, tom. ii., p. 835, &c. See also *Herm. Schyn's* Plenior deductio Historiæ Mennonit., cap. vi., p. 116. His writings, which are nearly all in the Dutch language, were published the most complete, Amsterdam, 1651, folio. One who is disgusted with a style immoderately diffuse and rambling, with frequent and needless repetitions, with great confusion in the thoughts and matter, with pious but extremely languid exhortations, will rise from the perusal of them with but little satisfaction. [A concise history of his life, or rather a development of his religious views, drawn up by himself, is found both prefixed to the complete edition of his works, (Amsterdam, 1651, fol.), and in the 2d vol. of *Herman Schyn's* History of the Mennonites (Historiæ Mennonitar. plenior deductio, p. 118, &c., Amsterdam, 1729, 8vo).—It contains, I. A short and lucid account, how and why he forsook popery. II. A short and plain Confession of Faith of the Mennonites. III. Concise instructions in questions and answers, derived from scripture, for such as would join their community. *Menno* was born in 1505, at Witmarsum in Friesland. In his 24th year, he became a priest of the Romish church in the village of Pinningen. His rector had some learning; and both he and another clergyman under him, had some acquaintance with the scriptures; while *Menno* had never read them, being afraid they would mislead him. But the thought at length occurred to him as he read mass, whether the bread and the wine could be the real body and blood of Christ. At first, he supposed this thought was a suggestion of the devil; and he often confessed it, and sighed and prayed over it, but could not get rid of it. With his fellow-clergymen, he daily spent his time in playing, drinking, and other indulgences. At length he took up reading the New Testament; and from that, he soon learned that he had hitherto been deceived, in regard to the mass; *Luther* also helped him to the idea, that disregarding human prescriptions did not draw after it eternal death. His examination of the scriptures carried him farther and farther, and he began to be called an evangelical preacher, and every body loved him. But when he heard that an honest man was put to death at Lewarden, because he had been rebaptized; he was at first surprised to hear of a repetition of baptism; he went to consulting the scriptures, and he there could find nothing said about infant baptism. He held a discussion on the subject with his rector; who was obliged to concede the same fact. Some ancient writers taught him, that children by such baptism were cleansed from original sin; but this seemed to him, according to the scriptures, to militate against the efficacy of *Christ's* blood. After this,—(we give, all along, his own account),—he turned to *Luther;* but his assertion that children must be baptized on account of their own faith, appeared contrary to the scriptures. Equally unsatisfactory to him was the opinion of *Bucer;* that the baptism of infants is necessary, in order that they be more carefully watched, and be trained up in the ways of the Lord; and also *Bullinger's* referring it to a covenant, and appealing to circumcision. Not long after this, he was made rector of his native village, Witmarsum; where he preached much indeed, from the scriptures; but without being himself made better. In the mean time, he glories in having attained to correct views of baptism and the Lord's supper, by the illumination of the Holy Ghost, and by frequent perusal of the scriptures. With the disturbances at Munster, he was greatly troubled; he ascribed them to erring zeal; and he opposed them in his sermons and exhortations. Yet he was so much affected by the example of the multitudes who sacrificed themselves for the interests of the party, that he felt more and more distress and shame on account of his own state of mind; he prayed God to aid him; his whole state of mind became changed; and he now taught Christian piety, much more purely and effectually. And the discovery which he had made of the corrupt state of the Romish church, induced him in the year 1536, utterly to renounce it, as well as his priestly office; which he calls his *departure from Babylon.* The next year, there came to him several godly Anabaptists, who most importunately entreated him, in their own name and in that of other devout men of the same faith, to become the teacher of this dispersed and persecuted company. He at length con

Anabaptists; yet perhaps one which was somewhat harsher, though better digested, than that of the wiser and more moderate Anabaptists, who merely wished to see the church restored to its long-lost purity, but had undefined conceptions about it. He therefore condemned the expectation of a new kingdom of Jesus Christ, to be set up in the world by violence and the expulsion of magistrates, which had been the prolific cause of so many seditions and crimes; he condemned the marvellous restitution of the church by a new and extraordinary effusion of the Holy Spirit; he condemned the licentiousness of polygamy and divorce; and he would not endure those who believed, that the Holy Spirit descended into the minds of many just as he did at the first establishment of Christianity, and manifested his presence by miracles, prophecies, divine dreams, and visions. The common Anabaptist doctrines in regard to infant baptism, a coming thousand years' reign of Christ before the end of the world, the inadmissibility of magistrates in the Christian church, the prohibition of wars and oaths by Christ, the inutility and the mischief of human learning,—these doctrines he retained indeed, but he so corrected and improved them, that they appeared to come nearer to accordance with the common tenets of Protestants. This system of religion was so highly recommended by the nature of the precepts themselves, by the eloquence of the preacher, and by the circumstances of the times, that it very easily gained the assent of most of the Anabaptists. And thus the influence of *Menno* caused the *Anabaptists* of both sorts, after excluding fanatical persons and rejecting opinions pernicious to the state, to become consolidated as it were into one family or community.(16)

sented: and he remarks, on this occasion, that he was called to the office of teacher, neither by the insurgents of Munster, nor by any other turbulent party, but by true professors of Christ and his word, who sought the salvation of all around them, and took up their cross. Thenceforth, during eighteen years, amid many perils and discouragements, poverty and want, and often concealed in lurking-places, with his wife and children, he discharged the duties of his office; and thereby (says he) hath God, in many cities and countries, brought his church to such a glorious state, that not only have a multitude of vicious persons been reclaimed, but also the most renowned doctors and the most cruel tyrants have been made to stand confounded and ashamed before those who have suffered with him. To this, which is *Menno*'s own account, other writers add, that with unwearied activity, in Friesland, Gelderland, Holland, and Brabant, in Westphalia, and generally in northern Germany, as far as Livonia, he either planted and strengthened Anabaptist churches, or reduced them to order and to unanimity; until, at last, in 1561, he died at Oldesloe in the duchy of Holstein.—Translated from *Schroeckh's* Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation, vol. v., p. 444, 447. —*Tr.*]

(16) These facts show, how the famous question concerning the origin of the Mennonites may be readily solved. The Mennonites use every argument they can devise, to prevent credence being given to what is taught in innumerable books, that the modern are the descendants of the ancient Anabaptists. See *Herm. Schyn's* Historia Mennonitar, cap. viii., ix., xxi., p. 223, &c. Nor is the reason of their zeal in this matter difficult to ascertain. This timid people, living dispersed among their enemies, are afraid, lest the malevolent should take occasion, from that relationship, to renew those laws against their existence and their safety, by which those ancient disturbers of the public peace were put down. At least, they hope the severe odium which has long rankled against them, will be much diminished, provided they can fully eradicate from the public mind the belief that the Mennonites are the successors of the Anabaptists, or rather are themselves Anabaptists, though reformed and made wiser than their predecessors. But I must candidly own, that after carefully comparing what the Mennonites and their antagonists have advanced on this subject, I am unable to determine what the precise point in dispute between them is. In the first place, if the Mennonites wish to maintain, that *Menno*, the founder of the

§ 10. *Menno* must have possessed more than human power, to be able to diffuse peace and good order throughout so discordant a body, and bind together in harmonious bonds men actuated by very different spirits. About the middle of the century therefore, a violent dispute arose among the Anabaptists, [or Mennonites], respecting excommunication, occasioned chiefly by *Leonard Bouwenson* and *Theodore Philip:* and its effects have continued down to the present time. The men just named not only maintained that all transgressors, even those that seriously lamented and deplored their fall, ought to be at once cast out of the church without previous admonition; but also, that the excommunicated were to be debarred all social intercourse with their wives, husbands, brothers, sisters, children, and other relatives. They likewise required obedience to a very austere and

present existing sect, was not infected with those opinions, by which the men of Munster and others like them drew upon themselves deserved punishments; and consequently, that he did not propose to establish a new church of Christ, entirely free from all evil, nor command the abolition of all civil laws and magistrates, nor impose upon himself and others by fanatical dreams; then they will find us all ready to agree with them. All this is readily conceded by those, who at the same time contend, that there most certainly was an intimate connexion between the ancient and the modern Anabaptists. Again; if the Mennonites would maintain, that the churches which have adopted the discipline of *Menno*, quite to the present time, have been studious of peace and tranquillity, have plotted no insurrections or revolutions among the people who were their fellow-citizens, have always been averse from slaughter and blood, and have shunned all familiarity with persons professing to have visions and to hold converse with God; and likewise have excluded from their public discourses, and from their confessions of faith, those [principles and tenets which were] causes, that led the ancient Anabaptists to pursue a different course of conduct; here also, we present them the hand of friendship and agreement. And finally; if they contend, that, not all who bore the name of Anabaptists prior to the times of *Menno*, were as delirious and as furious as *Munzer*, or the faction at Munster, and others; that many persons of this name abstained from all criminal and flagitious deeds, and only trod in the steps of the ancient Waldenses, Henricians, Petrobrussians, Hussites, and Wickliffites; and that these upright and peaceable persons subjected themselves to the precepts and opinions of *Menno;* we shall still make no objections.

But, I. If they would have us believe, that none of the *Mennonites* are, by birth and blood, descendants of those people who once overwhelmed Germany and other countries with so many calamities; or, that none of the furious and fanatical *Anabaptists* became members of the community which derives its name from *Menno;* then they may be confuted, both by the testimony of *Menno* himself, who proclaims that he had convinced some of this pestiferous faction, and also by many other proofs. The first Mennonite churches were certainly composed of Anabaptists, of both the better sort and the worse. Nor, if the Mennonites should admit this, (which is true beyond contradiction), would they expose themselves to more infamy, than we do, when we admit that our ancestors were blind idolaters.

And, II. We must be equally at variance with them, if they deny, that the Mennonites hold any portion at all of those opinions, which once betrayed the turbulent and seditious Anabaptists into so many and so enormous crimes. For not to mention, what has long since been remarked by others, that *Menno* himself styled those Anabaptists of Munster, whom his children at this day execrate as pests, his *brethren*, though with the qualification of *erring;* I say, not to mention this, it is the fact, that the very doctrine, concerning the nature of Christ's kingdom or the church of the New Testament, which led the ancient Anabaptists, step by step, to become furious and open rebels, is not yet wholly eradicated from the minds of the modern Mennonites; although it has gradually become weakened, and, in the more moderate, has ceased to vegetate, or at least, has lost its power to do harm. I will not here inquire, whether even the more peaceful community of *Menno*, has not, at any time, been agitated with violent commotions: nor am I disposed to pry into what may be now taking place among its minor sects and parties; for that the larger sects, especially those of North Holland, shun the men who are actuated by a fanatical spirit, is sufficiently evinced by the fact, that they most carefully exclude all Quakers from their communion.

difficult system of morals. But many of the Anabaptists looked upon this as going too far. And hence, very soon the Anabaptists became split into two sects; the one more lenient towards transgressors, the other more severe; the one requiring a sordid style of living and very austere morals, the other conceding something to human nature and to the elegances of life. *Menno* laboured indeed to restore harmony to his community, but discovering no possible way to effect it, he fluctuated as it were during his whole life, between those two sects. For at one time he seemed to favour the severer party, and at another the more lax brethren. And this inconstancy in one of so high authority, tended to increase not a little the disquietude and commotion among them.(17)

§ 11. These two large sects of Anabaptists [or Mennonites], are distinguished by the appellations of the *Fine* and the *Gross*, (*die Feinen* und *die Groben*, *Subtiles* et *Crassi*), i. e., the *more Rigid* and the *more Lax*.(18) Those called the *Fine* hold and observe, more strictly than the others, both the ancient doctrines and the morals and discipline of the Anabaptists; the *Gross* depart farther from the original opinions, morals, and discipline of the sect, and approach nearer to those of the Protestants. The greater part of the *Gross* or lax Mennonites, at first, were inhabitants of a region in the North of Holland, called *Waterland:* and hence this whole sect obtained the name of *Waterlanders*.(19) A majority of the severer sect were inhabitants of *Flanders;* and hence their whole sect received the name of *Flemings* or *Flandrians*. Among these *Flandrians*, soon after, there arose new broils and contentions; not indeed respecting doctrines, but respecting the offences for which men should be excommunicated, and other minor matters. And hence again, arose the two sects of *Flandrians* and *Frieslanders*, disagreeing in morals and discipline, and receiving their

(17) See the history of the contests and controversies among the Mennonites, previous to the year 1615; composed by some Mennonite writer, and translated from Dutch into German, by *Joach. Christ. Jehring*, and published, Jena, 1720, 4to; also *Sim. Fred. Rues*, Nachrichten von dem Zustande der Mennoniten; Jena, 1743, 8vo.

(18) ["The terms *fine* and *gross* are a literal translation of *groben* and *feinen*, which are the German denominations used to distinguish these two sects. The same terms have been introduced among the *Protestants* in Holland: the *fine* denoting a set of people, whose extraordinary, and sometimes fanatical devotion, resembles that of the English *Methodists;* while the *gross* is applied to the generality of Christians, who make no extraordinary pretensions to uncommon degrees of sanctity and devotion."—*Mael.*]

(19) See *Fred. Spanheim.* Elenchus controvers. Theolog., Opp., tom. iii, p. 772. This sect are also called *Johannites*, from *John de Ries*, [*Hans de Rus*] who in various ways was serviceable to them, and in particular, with the aid of *Lubbert Gerards*, in 1580, composed a *Confession* of faith. This Confession, which exceeds all the others of the Mennonites in simplicity and soundness, has been often published, and recently by *Herm. Schyn*, in his Historia Mennonitarum, cap. vii., p. 172. It was explained in a copious commentary, in 1686, by *Peter Joannis*, a Netherlander and minister among the Waterlanders. Yet this celebrated Confession is said, to be only the private Confession of that church over which its author presided, and not the general one of the Waterlander church. See *Rues*, Nachrichten, p. 93, 94. [For *Rues* asserts, that he had seen a document, according to which, an old minister of the church at Gouda affirmed before notaries and witnesses, that the Waterland churches had never bound themselves by any particular Confession of their faith: but that *Rys* drew up this Confession for some English Baptists, who retired to Holland, but would not unite themselves with the Waterlanders until they had ascertained what their doctrinal views were. *Rys* however, solemnly declared, that this Confession should not afterwards be binding on any one, but should be regarded as a mere private writing, which had reference only to the time then present. —*Schl.*]

appellations from the majority of their respective partisans. To these were added a third sect of *Germans;* for many [followers of *Menno*] had removed from Germany, and settled in Holland and the Netherlands. But the greatest part of the Flandrians, the Frieslanders, and the Germans, gradually came over to the moderate sect of Waterlanders, and became reconciled to them. Such of the more rigid as would not follow this example, are at this day, denominated the *old Flemings* or *Flandrians;* but they are far inferior in numbers to the more moderate [or the Waterlanders].

§ 12. As soon as fanatical delirium subsided among the Mennonites, all their sects, however diverse in many respects, agreed in this, that the principles of religion are to be derived solely from the holy scriptures. And to make this the more manifest, they caused their *Confessions* of faith, or papers containing a summary of their views of God and the right mode of worshipping him, to be drawn up almost in the very words of the divine books. The first of these Confessions both in the order of time and in rank, is that which the Waterlanders exhibit. This was followed by others; some of them common ones presented to the magistrates, and others peculiar to certain parties.(20) But there is ground for inquiry, whether these formulas contain *all* that the Mennonites believe true; or whether they omit some things, which are important for understanding the internal state of the sect. It will be seen indeed, by every reader who bestows on them but a moderate degree of attention, that the doctrines which seem prejudicial to society, particularly those respecting magistrates and oaths, are most cautiously guarded and embellished, lest they should appear alarming. Moreover, the discerning reader will easily perceive, that these points are not placed in their proper attitude, but appear artificially expressed. All this will be made clear from what follows.

§ 13. The old *Anabaptists*, because they believed they had the Holy Spirit for their guide and teacher, did not so much as think of drawing up a system of religious doctrines, and of imbuing the minds of their people with a sound knowledge of religion. And hence they disagreed exceedingly, on points of the greatest importance; for instance, respecting the divinity of the Saviour, which some professed and others denied, and respecting polygamy and divorce. A little more attention was given to this matter, by *Menno* and his disciples. Yet there was, even subsequently to his age, vast license of opinion on religious subjects among the Mennonites, and especially among those called the *Fine* or the more *rigid*. And this single fact would be sufficient proof, if other arguments were not at hand, that the leaders of the sect esteemed it the smallest part of their duty, to guard their people against embracing corrupt doctrines; and that

(20) *Herm. Schyn* treats expressly of these Confessions, in his plenior deductio Historiæ Mennonitar., cap iv., p. 78. And he concludes by saying (p. 115): *It hence appears, that the Mennonites, from the time of Menno, have been as well agreed in regard to the principal and fundamental articles of faith, as any other sect of Christians.* But if, perchance, the good man should bring us to believe so, he would still find it very difficult to persuade many of his brethren of it; who have not yet ceased to contend warmly, and who think that the points, which he regards as unimportant to religion and piety, are of vast moment. And indeed, how could any of the Mennonites, before this century, believe what he asserts; while the parties among them contended about matters which he treats with contempt, as if their eternal salvation hung suspended on them?

they considered the very soul of religion to consist in holiness of life and conduct. At length necessity induced first the Waterlanders, and afterwards the others, to set forth publicly a summary of their faith, digested under certain heads: for that rashness of dissenting and disputing on sacred subjects, which had long been tolerated, had drawn upon the community very great odium, and seemed to threaten to bring on it banishment, if not something worse. Yet the *Mennonite Confessions* appear to be rather shields, provided for blunting the points of their enemies' arguments, than established rules of faith from which no one may deviate. For if we except a portion of the modern Waterlanders, it was never decreed among them, as it is among other sects of Christians, that no one must venture to believe or to teach, otherwise than is laid down in the public formulas. It was an established principle with them all, from the beginning, (as is evinced by the general character and spirit of the sect), that religion is comprised in piety; and that the holiness of its members, is the surest index of a true church.

§ 14. If we are to form our judgment of the Mennonite religion from their *Confessions* of faith which are in every body's hands, in most things it differs but little from that of the Reformed; but it departs wider from that of the Lutherans. For they attribute to what are called the sacraments, no other virtue than that of being signs and emblems; and they have a system of discipline, not much different from that of the *Presbyterians*. The doctrines by which they are distinguished from all other Christian sects, are reducible to three heads. Some of these doctrines are common to all the sects of Mennonites: others are received only in certain of the larger associations; (and these are the doctrines which rendered *Menno* himself not perfectly acceptable to all): and lastly, others exist only in the minor and more obscure associations. These last rise and sink, by turns, with the sects that embrace them; and therefore deserve not a more particular notice.

§ 15. All the opinions which are common to the whole body, are founded on this one principle, as their basis; namely, that the kingdom which Christ has established on the earth, or the church, is a visible society or company in which is no place for any but holy and pious persons, and which therefore has none of those institutions and provisions which human sagacity has devised for the benefit of the ungodly. This principle was frankly avowed, by the ancestors of the Mennonites; but the moderns in their confessions, either cover it up under words of dubious import, or appear to reject it: yet they cannot actually reject it; or cannot, unless they would be inconsistent, and would deprive their doctrines of their natural basis.(21) But in regard to the most modern Mennonites, as they have

(21) This appears from their *Confessions*; and even from those, in which there is the greatest care to prevent the idea from entering the reader's mind. For instance, they first speak in lofty terms of the dignity, the excellence, the utility, and the divine origin of civil magistracy: and I am entirely willing, they should be supposed to speak here according to their real sentiments. But afterwards, when they come to the reasons why they would have no magistrates in their community, they incautiously express what is in their hearts. In the 37th article of the Waterland Confession, they say: *This political power, the Lord Jesus hath not established, in his spiritual kingdom, the church of the New Testament; nor hath he added it to the offices in his church.* The Mennonites believe, therefore, that the New Testament church is a republic which is free from all evils, and from restraints upon the wicked. But why, I ask, did they not frankly avow this fact, while explaining their views of the church; and not affect ambiguity and concealment?

departed in very many things from the views and the institutions of their fathers, so they have abandoned, nearly altogether, this principle respecting the nature of the Christian church. And in this matter, sad experience, rather than either reason or the holy Scriptures, has taught them wisdom. They therefore admit, first, that there is an *invisible* church of Christ or one not open to human view, which extends through all Christian sects. And in the next place, they do not place the mark of a true church, as they once did, in the holiness of *all* its members; for they admit, that the visible church of Christ, consists of both good and bad men. On the contrary they declare, that the marks of a true church are, a knowledge of the truth as taught by Jesus Christ, and the agreement of all the members in professing and maintaining that truth.

§ 16. Nevertheless, from that doctrine of the old Anabaptists respecting the church, flow the principal opinions by which they are distinguished from other Christians. This doctrine requires, I. that they should receive none into their church by the sacrament of baptism, unless they are adults, and have the full use of their reason. Because it is uncertain with regard to infants, whether they will become pious or irreligious; neither can they pledge their faith to the church, to lead a holy life.—It requires, II. that they should not admit of magistrates; nor suffer any of their members to perform the functions of a magistrate. Because, where there are no bad men, there can be no need of magistrates.—It requires, III. that they should deny the justice of repelling force by force, or of waging war. Because, as those who are perfectly holy cannot be provoked by injuries nor commit them, so they have no need of the support of arms in order to their safety.—It requires, IV. that they should have strong aversion to all penalties and punishments, and especially to capital punishments. Because punishments are aimed against the wickedness and the crimes of men; but the church of Christ is free from all crimes and wickedness.—It forbids, V. the calling of God to witness any transactions, or the confirming any thing by an oath. Because minds that are actuated solely by the love of what is good and right, never violate their faith, nor dissemble the truth.—From this doctrine follows likewise, VI. the severe and rigid discipline of the old Anabaptists, which produced so many commotions among them.(22)

§ 17. The Mennonites have a system of morals, (or at least, once had;

(22) [This derivation of the Anabaptist tenets from one single principle, although it appears forced, especially in regard to the second and third points, yet must be admitted to be ingenious. But whether it is historically true, is another question. Neither *Menno*, nor the first Anabaptists, had such disciplined intellects, as to be able thus systematically to link together their thoughts. Their tenets had been advanced, long before the Reformation, by the Cathari, the Albigenses, and the Waldenses, as also by the Hussites. This can be shown by unquestionable documents, from the records of the Inquisition and from confessions; and *Mosheim* himself maintains the fact, in sec. 2 of this chapter. Those sects were indeed oppressed, but not exterminated. Adherents to their tenets were dispersed everywhere, in Germany, in Switzerland, in Bohemia and Moravia; and they were imboldened by the Reformation, to stand forth openly, to form a closer union among themselves, and to make proselytes to their tenets. From them sprung the Anabaptists, whose teachers were men for the most part without learning, who understood the Scriptures according to the letter, and applied the words of the Bible without philosophical deductions, according to their perverse mode of interpretation, to their peculiar doctrines concerning the church, anabaptism, wars, capital punishments, oaths, &c. Even their doctrine concerning magistrates, they derived from Luke xxii., 25, and 1 Corinth. vi., 1. and the manner in which they were treated by the magistrates, may have had a considerable influence on their doctrine respecting them.—*Schl.*]

whether they still retain it is uncertain), coinciding with that fundamental doctrine which was the source of their other peculiarities; that is, one which is austere and rigid. For those who believe that sanctity of life is the only indication of a true church, must be especially careful, lest any appearance of sinful conduct should stain the lives of their people. Hence they all once taught, that *Jesus Christ* has established a new law for human conduct, far more perfect than the old law of Moses and the ancient prophets; and they would not tolerate any in their churches, whom they perceived swerving from the extreme of gravity and simplicity in their attitudes, looks, clothing, and style of living, or whose desires extended beyond the bare necessaries of life, or who imitated the customs of the world, or showed any regard for the elegances of fashionable life. But this ancient austerity became in a great measure extinct in the larger associations, particularly among the Waterlanders and the Germans, after they had acquired wealth by their merchandise and other occupations: so that at this day, the Mennonite congregations furnish their pastors with as much matter for censure and admonition, as the other Christian communities do theirs.(23) Some of the smaller associations however, and likewise the people who live remote from cities, copy more closely and successfully the manners, the abstinence, and the simplicity of their fathers.

§ 18. The opinions and practices which divide the principal associations of Mennonites, if we omit those of less importance, are chiefly the following. I. *Menno* denied that Christ received from the virgin Mary, that human body which he assumed: on the contrary, he supposed it was produced out of nothing, in the womb of the immaculate virgin, by the power of the Holy Ghost.(24) This opinion the *Fine* Anabaptists or the

(23) ["It is certain, that the Mennonites in *Holland*, at this day, are, in their tables, their equipages, and their country seats, the most luxurious part of the Dutch nation. This is more especially true of the Mennonites of *Amsterdam*, who are very numerous and extremely opulent."—*Macl.* This was written about the year 1764, and at the *Hague*, where *Dr. Maclaine* spent nearly his whole life. It is therefore the testimony of an *eye-witness*, residing on the spot.—*Tr.*]

(24) Thus the opinion of *Menno* is stated by *Herman Schyn*, Plenior deductio Historiæ Mennonitar., p. 164, 165: but others report it differently. After considering some passages in *Menno's* writings, in which he treats expressly on this subject, I think it most probable, that he was strongly inclined to this opinion; and that it was solely in this sense, that he ascribed to Christ a divine and *celestial body*. For whatever comes immediately from the Holy Spirit, may be fitly called celestial and divine. Yet I must confess, that *Menno* appears not to have been so certain of this opinion, as never to have thought of exchanging it for a better. For he expresses himself here and there, ambiguously, and inconstantly: from which I conclude, that he gave up the common opinion respecting the origin of Christ's human body; but was in doubt, which of the various opinions that occurred to his thoughts, to adopt in the place of it. See *Fuslin's* Centuria i. Epistolar. a Reformator. Helveticis scriptarum, p. 383, &c. *Menno* is commonly represented as the *author* of this doctrine concerning the origin of Christ's body, which his more rigid disciples still retain. But it appears to have been older than *Menno*, and to have been only adopted by him, together with other opinions of the Anabaptists. For *John Fabricius Boland* (Motus Monasteriensis, lib. x., v. 49, &c.) expressly testifies of many of the Anabaptists of Munster, (who certainly received no instructions from *Menno*), that they held this opinion concerning the body of Christ:

Esse (Christum) Deum statuunt alii, sed corpore carnem
Humanam sumpto sustinuisse negant:
At Diam mentem tenuis quasi fauce canalis
Per Mariæ corpus virginis isse ferunt.

[It is very probable, that this doctrine was propagated, from the Manichæans of the middle ages, to the Anabaptists. For thus *Moneta*, at least, says, in his Summa adv. Catharos et Waldenses, lib. iii., c. iii., Dicunt (*Cathari*) quod corpus spirituale accepit (Christus), operatione Spiritus Sancti, ex

old Flemings, still hold tenaciously; but all the other associations have long since given it up.(25)—II. The more rigid Mennonites after the example of their ancestors, regard as disciplinable offences, not only those wicked actions which are manifest violations of the law of God, but likewise the slightest indications either of a latent inclination to sensuality, or of a mind unsedate and inclined to follow the customs of the world; as, for example, ornaments for the head, elegant clothing, rich and unnecessary furniture, and the like: and all transgressors, they think, should be excommunicated forthwith and without a previous admonition; and that no allowance should be made for the weakness of human nature. But the other Mennonites think, that none but contemners of the divine law deserve excommunication, and they, only when they pertinaciously disregard the admonitions of the church.—III. The more rigid Mennonites hold, that excommunicated persons are to be shunned as if they were pests, and are to be deprived of all social intercourse. Hence the ties of kindred must be severed, and the voice of nature must be unheeded. Between parents and their children, husbands and their wives, there must be no kind looks, no conversation, no manifestation of affection, and no kind offices, when the church has once pronounced them unworthy of her communion. But the more moderate think, that the sanctity and the honour of the church are sufficiently consulted, if all particular intimacy with the excommunicated is avoided.—IV. The old Flemings maintain, that the example of *Christ*, which has in this instance the force of a law, requires his disciples to wash the feet of their guests in token of their love; and for this reason, they have been called *Podoniptæ* [*Feet-washers*]. But others deny, that this rite was enjoined by Christ.

§ 19. Literature and whatever comes under the name of learning, but especially philosophy, formerly were believed by this whole sect to be exceedingly prejudicial to the church of Christ, and to the progress of religion and piety. Hence, although the sect could boast of a number of writers in this century, yet not one of them affords pleasure to the reader, by either his ingenuity or his learning. The more rigid Mennonites retain this sentiment of their ancestors, quite to our times; and therefore despising the cultivation of their minds, they devote themselves to hand labour, the mechanic arts, and traffic. But the *Waterlanders* are honourably distin-

alia materia fabricatum.—*Schl.* And is it not probable, likewise, that most if not all the peculiar sentiments of the old Anabaptists of Germany, originated from the influence of that Manichæan leaven, which was introduced into Europe in the ninth century by the *Paulicians*; and which spread far, and produced from that time onward various fanatical and enthusiastic sects, quite down to the time of the Reformation? See the history of the Paulicians, in vol. ii., cent. ix., pt. ii., ch. v., and the chapters on *Heresies*, in the subsequent centuries.—*Tr.*]

(25) I perceive that many represent the *Waterlanders* in particular, as acceding to this doctrine of *Menno* respecting Christ's body. See Histoire des Anabaptistes, p. 223. Ceremonies et Coutumes de tous les peuples du monde, tom. iv., p. 200. But the *Confession* of the Waterlanders or that of *John Ries*, will itself confute this error. Add *Herm. Schyn's* Deductio plenior Historiæ Mennonitar., p. 165. [*Rues* (p. 16) attributes this doctrine solely to the *old Flemings*; yet he states as their opinion, that the human nature of Christ, which God first created out of nothing, received its support and growth from the blood of the holy virgin Mary. At the same time, they explicitly guarded themselves against the charge of partaking in the error of the *Valentinians*, by this doctrine. *Menno* embraced this doctrine, as *Rues* also maintains, because he could not conceive how the human nature of Christ could be without sin, if it be admitted that it descended from *Mary*. But his disciples appeal for proof to 1 Corinth. xv., 47, and John vi., 51.—*Schl.*]

guished from the others in this as well as in many other respects. For they permit several of their members, to prosecute at the universities the study of languages, history, antiquities, and especially the medical art, the utility of which they are unable to deny. And hence it is, that so many of their ministers at the present day, bear the title of Doctors of Physic. In our age, these milder and more discreet Anabaptists pursue also the study of philosophy; and they regard it as very useful to mankind. Hence, among their teachers, there are not a few who have the title of Masters of Arts. Indeed it is only a few years, since they established a college at Amsterdam, in which a man of erudition sustains the office of Professor of Philosophy. Yet they still persevere in the opinion, that theology must be kept pure and uncontaminated with philosophy, and must never be modified by its precepts. Even the more rigid *Flemings* also in our times, are gradually laying aside their ancient hatred of literature and science, and permitting their members to study languages, history, and other branches of learning.

§ 20. That ignorance, which the ancient Anabaptists reckoned among the means of their felicity, contributed much, indeed very much, to generate sects among them; with which they abounded from the first, much more than any other religious community. This will be readily conceded, by any one that looks into the causes and grounds of their dissensions. For their vehement contests were for the most part, not so much respecting the doctrines and mysteries of religion, as respecting what is to be esteemed *lawful*, *proper*, *pious*, *right* and *commendable*; and what, on the contrary, is to be accounted *criminal* and *faulty*. Because they maintained, that sanctity of life and purity of manners were the only sign of a true church: yet what was holy and religious, and what not so, they did not determine by reason and judgment, nor by a correct interpretation of the divine laws, (because they had no men who possessed solid knowledge on moral subjects), but rather by their feelings and imaginations. Now as this mode of discriminating good from evil is ever fluctuating and various, according to the different capacities and temperaments of men, it was unavoidable that different opinions should arise among them; and diversity of sentiment no where more certainly produces permanent schisms, than among a people who are ignorant, and therefore pertinacious.

§ 21. The Mennonites first obtained a quiet and stable residence in the United Provinces of Belgium, by the favour of *William* prince of Orange, the immortal vindicator of Batavian liberty; whom they had aided with a large sum of money in the year 1572, when he was destitute of the resources necessary for his vast undertakings.(26) Yet the benefits of this

(26) *Gerh. Brandt's* Historie de Reformatie in de Nedderlande, vol. i., book x., p. 525, 526. Ceremonies et Coutumes de tous les peuples du monde, tome iv, p. 201. [General History of the United Netherlands, (in German), vol. iii., p. 317, &c. Wagenær, in the passage here referred to, relates the matter thus. At Middleburg, because the Anabaptists would not take the citizen's oath, it was resolved to exclude them from the privileges of citizenship, or at least not to admit them fully to the rank of citizens. But the prince opposed it; and maintained, very rationally, that an Anabaptist's *affirmation* ought to be held equivalent to an oath; and that in this case, no farther coercion could be used with them, unless we would justify the Catholics in compelling the Reformed, by force, to adopt a mode of worship from which their consciences revolted. And afterwards, when the city council demanded of them to mount guard, and threatened to close their shops, if they refused; the prince commanded the city council, peremptorily, to trouble the Anabaptists no more, for declining oaths and the bearing of arms. This took place in the year 1578. —*Schl.*]

indulgence reached by slow degrees, to all that resided in Holland. For opposition was made to the will of the prince, both by the magistrates and by the clergy, and especially by those of Zealand and Amsterdam, who remembered the seditions raised by the Anabaptists only a short time previous.(27) These impediments [to their peace] were, in a great measure removed in this century, partly by the perseverance and authority of *William* and his son *Maurice*, and partly by the good behaviour of the Mennonites themselves; for they showed great proofs of their loyalty to the state, and became daily more cautious not to afford any ground to their adversaries for entertaining suspicions of them. Yet full and complete peace was first given to them, in the following century, A.D. 1626, after they had again purged themselves from those crimes and pernicious errors which were charged upon them, by the presentation of a *Confession* of their faith.(28)

§ 22. Those among the English who reject the baptism of infants, are not called *Anabaptists*, but only *Baptists*. It is probable that these *Baptists* originated from the Germans and the Dutch, and that they all once held the same sentiments with the *Mennonites*. But they are now divided into two general classes; the one called that of the *General Baptists* or *Remonstrants*, because they believe that God has excluded no man from salvation by any sovereign decree; the other are called *Particular* or *Calvinistic Baptists*, because they agree very nearly with the Calvinists or Presbyterians in their religious sentiments.(29) This latter sect reside chiefly at London, and in the adjacent towns and villages; and they recede so far from the opinions of their progenitors, that they have almost nothing in common with the other Anabaptists, except that they baptize only adults, and immerse totally in the water whenever they administer the ordinance. Hence, if the government requires it, they allow a professor of religion to take an oath, to bear arms, and to fill public civil offices. Their churches are organized after the *Presbyterian* [or more strictly, the *Independent*] plan; and are under the direction of men of learning and literature.(30) It appears from the *Confession* of these Baptists, published in 1643, that they then held the same sentiments as they do at the present day.(31)

(27) *Gerh. Brandt*, loc. cit., book xi., p. 555, 586, 587, &c., 609, 610, b. xiv., p. 780, b. xvi., p. 811.

(28) *Herm. Schyn's* Plenior deductio Historiæ Mennonitar., cap. iv., p. 79, &c.

(29) *William Whiston*. Memoirs of his life and writings, vol. ii., p. 461.

(30) *Anth. Wilh. Böhm's* Englische Reformations-historie, p. 151, 473, 536, book viii., p. 1152, &c. [*Crosby's* History of the English Baptists, vol. i. *Bogue* and *Bennet's* History of the Dissenters, vol. i., ch. i., § iii., p. 141, &c. Dutch and German Anabaptists or Mennonites appeared in England, and doubtless made some proselytes there, as early as the year 1535; and thenceforward to the end of the century. But they were so rigorously persecuted, not only by *Henry* VIII., but by *Edward* VI., queen *Mary*, and queen *Elizabeth*, that they can hardly be said to have existed as a visible sect in England, during the sixteenth century. And their division into *General* and *Particular* Baptists, did not take place till the reign of *James* I. See *Wall's* Hist. of Infant Baptism, pt. ii., ch. vii., § 6, p. 206, &c.—*Tr.*]

(31) Bibliotheque Britannique, tome vi., p. 2. [The Baptist Confession of 1643, was "set forth in the name of seven congregations then gathered in London." In September, 1689, elders and messengers from upward of one hundred congregations of Calvinistic Baptists in England and Wales, met in London, and drew up a more full Confession, and substantially the same in doctrine; but expressed very much in the words of the Westminster and the Savoy Confessions, with both which it agrees in doctrine, while in discipline and worship it

§ 23. The *General Baptists*, or as some call them the *Antipædobaptists*, who are dispersed in great numbers over many provinces of England, consist of illiterate persons of low condition; for, like the ancient *Mennonites*, they despise learning. Their religion is very general and indefinite; so that they tolerate persons of all sects, even Arians and Socinians; and do not reject any person, provided he professes to be a Christian, and to receive the holy scriptures as the rule of religious faith and practice.(32) They have this in common with the *Particular Baptists*, that they baptize only adults, and these they immerse wholly in water: but they differ from them in this, that they rebaptize such as were either baptized only in infancy and childhood, or were not immersed; which, if report may be credited, the *Particular* Baptists will not do.(33) There are likewise other peculiarities of this sect.—I. Like the ancient *Mennonites*, they regard their own church as being the only true church of Christ, and most carefully avoid communion with all other religious communities.—II. They immerse candidates for baptism, only once, and not three times; and they esteem it unessential, whether new converts be baptized in the name of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, or only in the name of *Jesus*.—III. With *Menno*, they expect a millennial reign of Christ.—IV. Many of them likewise, adopt *Menno's* opinion respecting the origin of Christ's body.—V. They consider the decree of the apostles, Acts xv., 25, respecting blood and things strangled, to be a law binding on the church universal.—VI. They believe that the soul, between death and the resurrection at the last day, has neither pleasure nor pain, but is in a state of insensibility.—VII. They use extreme unction.—VIII. Some of them, in addition to Sunday or the Lord's day, keep also the *Jewish Sabbath*.(34) I omit the notice of some

accords only with the latter. The *Calvinistic Baptists* in England have, generally, been on the most friendly terms with the *Independents* or *Congregationalists* there; and often both sects worshipped together, and were under the same pastors. See *Bogue* and *Bennet's* History of Dissenters, vol. i., p. 142, 143, vol. ii., p. 140, &c., also the Confession of the Baptist convention of 1689, and its Preface —*Tr.*]

(32) This appears from their Confession, drawn up in 1660, and published by *Wm. Whiston*, Memoires of his life, vol. ii., p. 561, which is so general, that all Christian sects, with the exception of a few points, could embrace it. *Whiston* himself, though an Arian, joined this community of Baptists; whom he considered to bear the nearest resemblance to the most ancient Christians. *Thomas Emlyn* also, a famous Socinian, lived among them; according to the testimony of *Whiston*.

(33) [I know not on what authority *Dr. Mosheim* makes this distinction between the *General* and the *Particular* Baptists: and I know of no sufficient proof of its reality. Neither does it appear, as *Dr. Mosheim* seemed to be informed, that the *General* Baptists were *more numerous* in England, than the *Particular* Baptists. On the contrary, I suppose the former, to have always been the smaller community; and at the present day, they are only about one sixth part as numerous, as the *Particular* Baptists. See *Bogue* and *Bennet*, loc. cit., vol. iv., p. 328. —*Tr.*]

(34) These statements are derived from *Wm. Whiston's* Memoirs of his life, vol. ii., p. 461, and from *Wall's* Hist. of Infant Baptism, pt. ii., p. 390, &c. ed Latin, [p. 280, &c., ed. London, 1705.— *Wall* does not represent all these as distinguishing tenets of the *General Baptists*. He enumerates the various peculiarities to be found among the *English Baptists* of all sorts. Some of the peculiarities mentioned, constitute distinct sects, as the eighth, which gives rise to the small and now almost extinct sect of *Seventh-day Baptists*; who however do not keep *both* days, *Saturday* and *Sunday*, but only the former. The 2d peculiarity, so far as respects a *single application* of water, is not peculiar to the *Baptists*: and so far as it respects baptizing *in the name of Jesus* only, was confined, (as *Wall* supposed), to the *General Baptists*, who were early inclined to Anti-Trinitarianism, and of late in England, have generally taken that ground. —*Tr.*]

minor points. These Baptists have *bishops*, whom they call messengers, (for thus they interpret the word ἄγγελος, in the Apocalyptical epistles), and *presbyters* and *deacons*. Their *bishops* are often men of learning.(35)

§ 24. *David George* [or *Joris*], a Hollander of Delft, gave origin and name to a singular sect. Having at last forsaken the Anabaptists, he retired to Basle in 1544, assumed a new name, [*John Bruck von Binnengen*], and there died, in 1556. He was well esteemed by the people of Basle, so long as he lived; for being a man of wealth, he united magnificence with virtue and integrity. But after his death, his son-in-law *Nicholas Blesdyck*, accused him before the senate of most pestilent errors; and the cause being tried, his body was committed to the common hangman to be burned. Nothing can be more impious and base than his opinions, if the historians of his case and his adversaries have estimated them correctly. For he is said to have declared himself to be a third *David*, and another son of God, the fountain of all divine wisdom; to have denied the existence of heaven and hell, both good and bad angels, and a final judgment; to have treated all the laws of modesty and decorum with contempt; and to have taught other things equally bad.(36) But if I do not greatly mistake,

(35) *Whiston*, Memoirs of his life, vol. ii., p. 466, &c. There is extant, *Thomas Crosby's* History of the English Baptists, London, 1728, 4 vols. 8vo, which, however, I have never seen. [This *Crosby* was himself a *General Baptist*; and kept a private school, in which he taught young men mathematics, and had also a small bookstore. He died in 1752. See *Alberti's* Letters on the most recent state of religion and learning in England, (in German), Preface to vol. iv. From *Crosby*, *Alberti* has translated the Confessions of both the Particular and the General Baptists into German, and subjoined them, as an Appendix to his fourth volume, p. 1245, &c., and 1323, &c.—*Schl.* The Rev. *John Smyth*, is commonly represented as the father of the sect of *General* or *Arminian* Baptists in England. (See *Bogue* and *Bennet*, History of Dissenters, vol. i., p. 150.) He was fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, a popular preacher, and a great sufferer for nonconformity. Separating from the church of England, he joined the Brownists; was one of their leading men in 1592, and was imprisoned during eleven months. At length he fled, with other Brownists, to Holland; and in 1606, joined the English Brownist church at Amsterdam. Here he fell into Arminian and Baptist opinions, on which he had disputes with *Ainsworth*, *Robinson*, and others; and he removed, with his adherents, to Leyden, where he died in 1610. Soon after his death, his followers returned to England; and, as is generally supposed, they were the first congregation of English General Baptists. See his life in *Brook's* Lives of the Puritans, vol. ii., p. 195, &c.—*Tr.*]

(36) See the Historia Davidis Georgii, by his son-in-law, *Nic. Blesdyck*, published by *Jac. Revius:* also his Life, written in German, by *Jac. Stolterfoth:* and many others. Among the more modern writers, see *Godfr. Arnold*, Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, vol. i., book xvi., ch. xvi., § 44, &c., and his extensive collections, in vindication of the reputation of *David George*, in vol. ii., p. 534, &c. See also p. 1185, &c., and *Henry More's* Enthusiasmus triumphatus, sect. xxxiii., &c. p. 23, &c.—Add especially, the documents which are brought to light, in my History of Michael Servetus, (in German), p. 425, &c. [*David Joris* was born at Delft, in 1501. Though placed at school, he learned nothing. But his inclination led him to learn the art of painting on glass, which caused him to travel in the Netherlands, France, and England. Returning in 1524, he pursued that business in his native town. The Reformation here caused considerable commotion; and in 1530, *Joris*, for obstructing a Catholic procession, was imprisoned, whipped, and had his tongue bored. He at length turned to the Anabaptists: but being more moderate than they, and opposed to their tumultuous proceedings, it was not till 1534 that he actually was rebaptized. He then joined the party of *Hoffmann;* but he was not well pleased with any of them: and at length, he united some contending parties together, and actually established a particular sect of Anabaptists. He next began to have visions and revelations. As his adherents suffered persecution in Westphalia and Holland he often attended them and comforted and animated them, in their dying hours. He saw his own mother de-

the barbarous and coarse style of his compositions,—for he possessed some genius but no learning, led his opposers often to put a harsh and unjust construction upon his sentences. At least, that he possessed more sense and more virtue than is commonly supposed, is evinced not only by his books, of which he published a great many, but also by his disciples, who were persons by no means base, but of great simplicity of manners and character, and who were formerly numerous in Holstein, and are said to be so still in Friesland and in other countries.(37) In the manner of the more moderate Anabaptists, he laboured to revive languishing piety among his fellow-men: and in this matter, his imagination which was excessively warm, so deceived him that he falsely supposed he had divine visions; and he placed religion in the exclusion of all external objects from the thoughts, and the cultivation of silence, contemplation, and a peculiar and indescribable state of the soul. The *Mystics* therefore of the highest order, and the *Quakers*, might claim him, if they would; and they might assign him no mean rank among their sort of people.

§ 25. An intimate friend of *David George*, but of a somewhat different turn of mind, *Henry Nicolai* of Westphalia, gave much trouble to the Dutch and the English, from the year 1555, by founding and propagating the *Family of Love*, as he denominated his sect. To this man nearly the same remarks apply, as were made of his friend. He would perhaps have in great measure avoided the foul blots that many have fastened upon him, if he had possessed the genius and learning requisite to a correct and lucid expression of his thoughts. What his aims were, appears pretty clearly from the *name* of the sect which he set up.(38) For he declared himself divinely appointed and sent, to teach mankind that the whole of religion consists in the exercise of divine *love;* that all other things, which are supposed to belong either to religion or to the worship of God, are of no importance; and of course it is of no consequence what views any one has of the divine nature, provided he burns with a flame of piety and love. To these opinions, he perhaps added some other fanciful views, as is usual

capitated at Delft, in 1537. A monitory letter which he sent to the senate of Holland, caused the bearer to lose his head.—In 1539, the landgrave of Hesse, to whom he applied for protection, offered to afford it, provided he would become a Lutheran. In 1542, he published his famous Book of Wonders, in which he exposed all the fanciful opinions that floated in his imagination. He wandered in various countries, till he was safe no where. Therefore, in 1544 he retired to Basle; where he lived twelve years, under the name of *John von Brügge;* was owner of a house in the city, and an estate in the country; was a peaceable and good citizen, and held communion with the Reformed church.—His son-in-law *Blesdyck*, was a Reformed preacher in the Palatinate; and had some variance with *Joris* before his death. Afterwards, provoked perhaps by the disposition *Joris* made of his property, he brought heavy charges against him. His family and friends and acquaintances, denied the truth of the charges before the court. But what they would not admit, was attempted to be proved from his writings. The university and the clergy pronounced his opinions heretical; and the dead man, who could no longer defend himself, was condemned. See *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, vol. v., p. 442, &c., and *Von Einem's* and *Schlegel's* notes upon this section of Mosheim.—*Tr.*]

(37) See *Jo. Möller's* Introductio in Histor. Chersones. Cimbricæ, part ii., p. 116, &c., and his Cimbria Litterata, tom. i., p. 422, &c.

(38) See *Jo. Hornbeck's* Summa Controversiarum, lib. vi., p. 393. *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. i., book xvi., ch. xxi., § 36., p. 746. *Ant. Wilh. Böhm's* Englische Reformationshistorie, book iv., ch. v., p. 541, &c.

with men in whom the imagination predominates; but what they were in particular, I apprehend may be better learned from his books, than from the confutations of his adversaries.(39)

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF THE SOCINIANS.

§ 1, 2. The Name and Origin of the Socinians.—§ 3. Their first Beginnings.—§ 4. Michael Servetus.—§ 5. His Doctrines.—§ 6. Other Anti-Trinitarians.—§ 7. False Originations of Socinianism.—§ 8. Its true Origination.—§ 9. Its Progress.—§ 10. Summary View of this Religion.—§ 11. Proceedings of Faustus Socinus.—§ 12. He modified the Unitarian Religion.—§ 13. Propagation of Socinianism in Transylvania and Hungary.—§ 14. In Holland and England.—§ 15. The Foundation of this Religion.—§ 16. Its fundamental Principle.—§ 17. Summary of it.—§ 18. Moral Principles.—§ 19. Racovian Catechism.—§ 20. State of Learning among Socinians.—§ 21. Method of teaching Theology.—§ 22. Controversies of the Socinians: Budneists or Budnæans.—§ 23. Succeeded by Davides, Franken, and others.—§ 24. The Farnovian Sect.

§ 1. The *Socinians* derived their name from the illustrious house of *Sozzini*, which long flourished at Sienna a noble city of Tuscany, and gave birth, it is said, to a number of distinguished men. For it was from this family were descended *Lælius* and *Faustus Socinus*, who are commonly regarded as the parents of the sect. *Lælius Socinus* was the son of *Mari-*

(39) The last and most learned of those who attacked the *Familists*, was *Henry More*, the celebrated English divine and philosopher, in his Mystery of Godliness, book vi., ch. xii.–xviii. *George Fox*, the father of the Quakers, severely chastised this *Family of Love*, because they would take an oath, dance, sing, and be cheerful; and he called them a company of fanatics. See *Sewel's* History of the Quakers, book iii., p. 88, 89, 344, &c. [*Henry Nicolai* or *Nicholas*, was born at Munster, and commenced his career about the year 1546, in the Netherlands; thence he passed over to England, in the latter years of *Edward* VI., and joined the Dutch congregation in London. But his sect did not become visible till some time in the reign of queen Elizabeth. In 1575, they laid a Confession of their faith, with a number of their books, before the parliament, and prayed for toleration. In 1580, the queen and her council undertook to suppress them. They continued in England till the middle of the following century, when they became absorbed in other sects. *Nicolai* published a number of tracts and letters in Dutch, for the edification of his followers, and to vindicate his principles against gainsayers. In one of his pieces, he mystically styles himself: "A man, whom God had awaked from the dead, anointed and filled with the Holy Ghost, endowed with God, in the Spirit of his love, and elevated with Christ to an inheritance in heavenly blessings, enlightened with the Spirit of heavenly truth, and with the true light of the all-perfect Being," &c. In his preface to one of his tracts, he calls himself: "The chosen servant of God, by whom the heavenly revelation should again be made known to the world." His followers in 1575, affirmed, that they neither denied *that* baptism which consists in repentance and newness of life, nor the holy sacrament of baptism, which betokens the new birth in Christ, and which is to be administered to children: that they admitted also the perfect satisfaction made by Christ for the sins of men.—They appeared always cheerful, and in a happy state of mind; which offended the more gloomy Mystics, and produced heavy charges against them. Yet nothing appeared in their moral conduct, to justify those criminations. *Arnold*, Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. ii., book xvi., c. 21, § 36, p. 873, ed. Schaffhausen; and *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, vol. v., p. 478, &c.—*Tr.*]

anus, a celebrated lawyer; and to great learning and talents he added,—as even his enemies acknowledge,—a pure and blameless life. Leaving his native country, from religious considerations, in 1547, he travelled over various countries, France, England, Holland, Germany, and Poland; every where examining carefully the opinions of such as had abandoned the Romish church, concerning God and divine things; for the sake of discovering and finding the truth. At length, he settled down at Zurich in Switzerland, and there died in the year 1562, when he was not yet forty years old.(1) Being a man of a mild and gentle spirit, and averse from all contention, he adopted the *Helvetic Confession*, and wished to be thought a member of the Swiss church: yet he did not absolutely conceal his doubts on religious subjects; but proposed them in his letters, to learned friends with whom he was intimate.(2) But *Faustus Socinus*, his nephew and heir, is said to have drawn from the writings left by *Lælius*, his real sentiments concerning religion, and by publishing them, to have gathered the sect.

§ 2. The name *Socinians* is often used in two different senses; a proper and an improper, or a limited and a more general. For in common speech, all are denominated *Socinians*, who teach doctrines akin to those of the Socinians; and especially those who either wholly deny, or weaken and render dubious, the Christian doctrine of three persons in the Godhead, and that of the divine nature of our Saviour. But in a more limited sense, those only are called Socinians, who receive, either entire or in its principal parts, that system of religion, which *Faustus Socinus* either produced himself, or set forth when produced by his uncle, and recommended to the *Unitarian brethren* (as they choose to be called) living in Poland and Transylvania.(3)

§ 3. While the Reformation was still immature, certain persons, who

(1) *Jo. Cloppenburg*, Diss. de origine et progressu Socinianismi. *Jo. Hornbeck*, Summa Controversiarum, p. 563, &c. *Jo. Henry Hottinger*, Historia Ecclesiast., tom. ix., p. 417, &c., and others.

(2) *Hieron. Zanchius*, Præfatio ad librum de tribus Elohim. *Theod. Beza*, Epistolar. volumen, ep. lxxxi., p. 167. Several writings are ascribed to him: (see *Sand's* Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar., p. 18), but it is very doubtful, whether he was the author of any of them

(3) There is still wanting a full and accurate history, both of the sect which follows the *Socini*, and also of *Lælius* and *Faustus Socinus*, and of those next to them most active in establishing and building up this community. For the curiosity of those who wish to acquire an accurate knowledge of this whole subject, is awakened but not satisfied, by what they find in *John Hornbeck's* Socinianismus Confutatus, vol. i. *Abraham Calovius*, Opera Anti-Socinians; *Jo. Cloppenburg's* Diss. de origine et progressu Socinianismi, (Opp., tom. ii., Lugd. Bat., 1708, 4to): *Christopher Sandius*, Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitariorum; *Stanisl. Lubieniecius*, Historia Reformationis Polonicæ; *Sam. Fred. Lauterbach's* Polnisch-Arianischen Socinianismus, Frankf., 1725, 8vo. And the Histoire de Socinisme, by *Lamy*, Paris, 1723, 4to, is a compilation from the common writers, and abounds not only with errors, but likewise with various matter quite foreign from a history of the Socinian sect and religion The very industrious and learned *Maturin Viess la Croze* promised the world, a complete history of Socinianism down to our times; see his Dissert. Historiques, tome i., p. 142. But he did not fulfil his promise. [Besides the above, there are *G. G. Zeltner's* Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfini quondam academiæ infesti arcana, Lips., 1729, 4to. *J. Toulmin's* Memoires of the life, character, sentiments and Writings of Faustus Socinus, Lond., 1777, 8vo. *F. Sam. Bock's* Historia Antitrinitariorum, maxime Socinianismi et Socinianorum, quorum auctores, promotores, cœtus, templa recensentur; Koningsb., 1774–84, 2 vols. 8vo. (The first vol gives account of modern Socinian authors; and the second traces the origin of Anti-Trinitarian sm. The whole, therefore, is only a broad introduction to a proper History of the Socinian community.) *Ch. F. Ilgen*, Vita Lælii Socini, Lips., 1814, 8vo. —*Tr.*]

looked upon everything the Romish church had hitherto professed as erroneous, began to undermine the doctrine of our Saviour's divinity, and the truths connected with it; and proposed reducing the whole of religion to practical piety and virtue. But the vigilance both of the Lutherans and of the Reformed and papists, promptly resisted them, and prevented their organizing a sect. As early as the year 1526, divine honours were denied to Jesus Christ, by *Lewis Hetzer*, a name famous among the vagrant Anabaptists, and who was beheaded at Constance in 1529.(4) Nor were there wanting, other men of like sentiments among the Anabaptists, though that whole sect cannot be charged with this error. Besides these, *John Campanus* of Juliers, in what year is not ascertained, among other unsound doctrines which he spread at Wittemberg and elsewhere, made the Son of God to be inferior to the Father; and declared the appellation *Holy Spirit* to denote, not a divine *person*, but the *nature* both of the Father and the Son: that is, he revived substantially the monstrous errors of the Arians.(5) In the territory of the Grisons, in Switzerland, at Strasburg, and perhaps elsewhere, one *Claudius* an Allobrogian or Savoyard, excited much commotion about the year 1530 and onward, by impugning the divinity of our Saviour.(6) But none of these were able to establish a sect.

§ 4. Those who watched over the interests of the Reformed church, were much more alarmed by the conduct of *Michael Servede*,(7) or *Serve-*

(4) *Christ. Sand's* Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitarior., p. 16. *Jo. Bapt. Ottius*, Annales Anabaptist, p. 50. *Jo. Jac. Breitinger's* Museum Helveticum, tom. v., p. 391, tom. vi., p. 100, 479, &c. [See above, p. 203, note (7).—*Tr.*]

(5) See *Jo. Geo. Schelhorn's* very learned Dissertation, de Joh. Campano, Anti-Trinitario; in his Amœnitates Litterar., tom. xi., p. 1–92. [He was a native of Mæseyk in the territory of Liege, and came to Wittemberg in 1528; but so concealed his opinions, that they first became known after he had retired to Marpurg; where he wished to take part in the public dispute, and to debate with *Luther* on the subject of the Lord's supper, but was refused. He repeated the same at Torgaw, where he likewise sought in vain to dispute with *Luther*. This filled him with resentment against *Luther* and his associates, and induced him to quit Wittemberg, (to which he had returned), and go to Niemek; the pastor of which, *Wicelius*, fell under suspicion of Anti-Trinitarianism in consequence of his harbouring *Campanus*, and soon after went over to the Catholics. *Campanus* went from Saxony to the duchy of Juliers; and both orally and in writing, declared himself opposed to the Reformers, and sought underhandedly to disseminate his Arian doctrines. But he was committed to prison by the Catholics, at Cleves; and continued in confinement twenty-six years. Whether he made his escape from prison, or was set at liberty, is not known. All we know, is that he lived to a great age. The substance of his doctrine, may be learned from the very scarce book, entitled, The divine and Holy Scripture, many years since obscured and darkened by unwholesome doctrine and teachers (by God's permission), now restored and amended; by the very learned *John Campanus*, 1532, 8vo, (in German).—*Schl.*]

(6) See *Jo. Geo. Schelhorn's* Epistolary Dissert. de Mino Celso Senensi, Claudio item Allobroge, homine fanatico et SS. Trinitatis hoste; Ulm, 1748, 8vo. *Jo. Jac. Breitinger's* Museum Helveticum, tom. vii., p. 667. *Jo. Haller's* Epistle, in *Jo. Conr. Füssli's* Centuria Epistolar. viror. eruditor., p. 140, &c. [He first held Christ to be a mere man; but the Swiss divines brought him to admit, that he was the natural Son of God; though he would not allow his eternal existence; and he positively denied three persons in the Godhead. He also maintained, that the beginning of John's Gospel had been falsified. He was imprisoned at Strasburg; and then banished. *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, vol. v., p 491.—*Tr.*]

(7) By rejecting the last syllable of the name, which is a common Spanish termination, there remains the name *Serve*: and the letters of this name, a little transposed, produce *Revs*; which is the name *Servetus* assumed in the title-pages of his books. Omitting also his family name, altogether, he called himself from his birthplace, *Michael Villanovanus*, or simply, *Villanovanus*.

tus as his name is written in Latin, a Spanish physician, born at Villa Nueva in Aragon, a man of no ordinary genius and of extensive knowledge. He first published in 1531, vii. Books, de Trinitatis erroribus; and the next year, two Dialogues, de Trinitate; in which he most violently assailed the opinion held by the great body of Christians, respecting the divine nature and the three persons in it. Subsequently, after retiring to France and passing through various scenes, he fixed his residence at Vienne, where he was a successful practitioner of physic; and now, by his strong power of imagination, he devised a new and singular species of religion, which he committed to a book that he secretly printed at Vienne, in 1553, and which he entitled: Restitutio Christianismi (a restoration of Christianity). Many things seemed to conspire, to favour his designs: genius, learning, eloquence, courage, pertinacity, a show of piety, and lastly, numerous patrons and friends, in France, Germany, and Italy, whom he had conciliated by his natural and acquired endowments. But all his hopes were frustrated by *Calvin;* who caused *Servetus* to be seized in 1553, at Geneva, as he was passing through Switzerland towards Italy, after his escape from prison at Vienne, and to be accused of blasphemy by one of *Calvin's* servants. The issue of the accusation was, that *Servetus*, as he would not renounce the opinions he had embraced, was burned alive by a decree of the judges, as being a pertinacious heretic and blasphemer. For in that age the ancient laws against heretics, enacted by the emperor *Frederic* II. and often renewed afterwards, were in full force at Geneva. A better fate was merited by this highly gifted and very learned man: yet he laboured under no small moral defects; for he was beyond all measure arrogant, and also ill-tempered, contentious, unyielding, and a semi-fanatic.(8)

(8) I have composed, in the German language, a copious history of this man, who was so unlike every body but himself; which was published at Helmstadt, 1748, 4to, and again, with large additions, Helmst., 1749, 4to. [*Dr. Maclaine* recommends to those who cannot read the German, to peruse a juvenile production of one of *Mosheim's* pupils, composed twenty years earlier, entitled: Historia Mich. Serveti, quam, præside J. Laur. Mosheimio, &c., exponit *Henricus ab Alhwaerden*, Helmst., 1727, 4to. But *Mosheim*, in *his* history of Servetus, pronounces this an incorrect performance, and not to be relied on. *Von Einem* here introduces, in a long note of 23 pages, an epitome of *Mosheim's* history of Servetus. The account which *Schroeckh* gives of Servetus, (Kirchengesch. seit der Reformat., vol. v., p. 519 &c.), accords in general with that of *Mosheim*, as abridged by *Von Einem*. From both these, the following sketch is made.

He was born at Villa Nueva, in Aragon, A.D 1509 His father was a lawyer, and sent him to Toulouse to study law. But he preferred literature and theology. Hebrew, Greek, the fathers, the Bible, and the writings of the Reformers, seemed to have engaged his chief attention. On his return to Spain, he connected himself with *Jo. Quintana*, confessor to the emperor *Charles* V. and accompanied him to Italy, where he witnessed the emperor's coronation at Bologna, A.D. 1529. The year following, he accompanied *Quintana* into Germany; and perhaps was at Augsburg, when the Protestants presented their Confession of faith; and he might there first become acquainted with *Bucer* and *Capito*. When and where he separated from *Quintana*, does not appear. But in the year 1530, he went to Basle, to confer with *Œcolampadius*. He had then struck out a new path in theology. He rejected the doctrine of three divine persons; denied the eternal generation of the Son; and admitted no eternity of the Son, except in the purpose of God. *Œcolampadius* attempted in vain to bring him to other views; and he laid his case before *Zwingle*, *Bucer*, *Capito*, and *Bullinger;* who all considered him a gross heretic. He left Basle, determined to publish his projected work. It was printed at Hagenau, in 1531; and, at once, was every where condemned *Quintana* laid it before the emperor, who ordered it to be suppressed. *Servetus* was assailed by his best friends, wherever he went, and was pressed to abandon his errors. He therefore wrote his Dialogues, which he

§ 5. *Servetus* had devised a strange system of religion; a great part of which was intimately connected with his notions of the nature of things,

printed in 1532. He there condemned his former book, as a juvenile and ill-reasoned performance; yet brought forward substantially the same doctrines, and urged them with all his powers of logic and satire. In 1533, he went to Italy, and travelled in France. He studied a while at Paris; then went to Orleans; and thence to Lyons, where he resided two years, as a superintendent of the press; held a correspondence with *Calvin*, and began to write his great theological work. In 1537, he went again to Paris, became a master of arts, and lectured on mathematics and astronomy. He also devoted a year to the study of physic; and now commenced medical writer and physician; yet continued to labour on his Restoration of Christianity. But soon he got into collision with the medical fraternity, and had to leave Paris. In 1538, he went to Lyons, thence to Avignon, and thence to Charlieu, where he resided as a physician till 1540. He next went again to Lyons, and soon after to Vienne, where he resided twelve years, as a physician, under the patronage of the archbishop and the clergy, to whom he rendered himself quite acceptable. During this time, though still labouring secretly upon his Restoration of Christianity, he professed to be a sound Catholic, and passed currently for one. He also re-edited Ptolemy's geography, with corrections and notes; and published notes on *Pagnin's* Latin Bible, the chief object of which was, to show that all the Old Testament prophecies, which were commonly applied to Christ, had a previous and literal fulfilment in events prior to his advent, and only an allegorical application to him. At length he determined to print his favourite work on theology. It was worked off, in a retired house in Vienne, by his friends; and he himself corrected the press. It was finished in January, 1553; and bore on its title-page only the initials of his name, M. S. V. (Michael Servetus Villanovanus). Parcels of the book were sent to Lyons, to Frankfort, and elsewhere. A few copies reached Geneva; and *Calvin* was one of the first who read it. Near the end of February, one *Tric*, a young French Protestant residing at Geneva, wrote to his Catholic friend at Lyons, who laboured hard to convert him to popery, taxing the Catholics of Lyons with harbouring *Servetus*, the impious author of this new book which excited such universal abhorrence. This letter first awakened suspicion at Vienne, that *Servetus* was the author of it. A process before the Inquisition was commenced against him; but the proof was deemed insufficient. The court however prosecuted the matter with zeal, and obtained more and more evidence against him. *Servetus*, at length, foreseeing the probable result, took to flight. The court still proceeded, till they deemed the evidence sufficient, and then condemned him in his absence. *Servetus* fled to Geneva; and there lay concealed four weeks, waiting for an opportunity to proceed to Italy and Naples. Just as he was getting into a boat to depart, he was discovered by *Calvin* himself; who gave notice immediately to the government, and they apprehended him. *Nicholas de la Fontaine*, *Calvin's* secretary, took the part of an accuser; and *Calvin* himself is supposed to have framed the 38 articles of charge. They were taken from his writings, especially his last work; and related to his views of the Trinity and infant baptism; his taxing Moses with falsely representing the land of Canaan as very fertile; his perverting the prophecies concerning Christ; and several other points of less importance In the first hearing, *Servetus* acknowledged himself the author of the books whence the charges were drawn; but either explained away, or justified, the articles alleged; and *La Fontaine* was unable to meet his arguments. In the second hearing, *Calvin* was present; and he exposed the evasive pleas of the criminal. In the mean time, the council of Geneva wrote to the authorities of Vienne, informing them of the arrest of *Servetus*, and inquiring respecting the proceeding against him at Vienne. The governor of the castle of Vienne came to Geneva, exhibited a copy of the sentence passed upon *Servetus*, and requested that the prisoner might be delivered up to him, to be conveyed to Vienne. *Servetus* was called before the court, and with tears entreated, that he might not be delivered up; but that he might be tried at Geneva. To gratify his wishes, the court of Geneva refused to give him up, and proceeded in his trial. He denied the competence of a *civil* court to try a case of heresy: but his objection was overruled. He also appealed to the council of 200: but the appeal was not admitted. He attempted to accuse *Calvin* of heresy; but the court would not listen to his accusations. He objected, that *Calvin* reigned at Geneva, and begged to have his case tried by the other cantons. Accordingly the court ordered that *Calvin* should extract objectionable passages from *Servetus'* books, in his own words; that *Servetus* should subjoin such explanations and argu-

which were also strange; nor can it be stated fully in a few words. He supposed in general, that the true doctrine of Jesus Christ was lost, even before the council of Nice; and indeed that it was never taught, with sufficient clearness and perspicuity; and that the restitution and explanation of it, were divinely committed to him. As respects God and the divine Trinity, he believed in general, that the supreme Being before the foundation of the world, produced in himself and formed two *personal representations, economies, dispositions, dispensations*, or *modes of existence*, (for he did not always use the same terms), namely, the *Word* and the *Holy Spirit;* by which he might both make known his will to mankind, and impart to them his blessings. That the *Word* was joined to the man *Christ*, who was by the efficient volition of God born of the virgin *Mary;* and that on this account, *Christ* might justly be called God. That the *Holy Spirit* animates the created universe; and in particular, produces holy and divine emotions and purposes in men. That after the destruction of this world, both these *Economies* will cease to be, and will be reabsorbed in God. Yet this doctrine he did not always state in the same manner, and he often uses slippery and ambiguous terms; so that it is exceedingly difficult to ascertain his real meaning. His moral principles agreed in many respects, with the opinions of the *Anabaptists:* with whom also he agreed in this, that he most severely condemned the baptism of infants.

§ 6. This projected restoration of the church, of which *Servetus* hoped

ments as he saw fit; then *Calvin* to reply, and *Servetus* to answer; and the whole be transmitted to Bern, Basle, Zurich, and, Schaffhausen, for the opinion of those cantons. This was accordingly done. The reply from all the cantons was, that the Genevans were in duty bound to restrain the madness and wickedness of *Servetus*, and to prevent him from propagating his errors in future. But the manner in which this object should be accomplished, was left to the discretion of the court of Geneva. The authorities of Basle however, intimated, that a perpetual imprisonment might be sufficient. The court of Geneva, now unanimously, condemned *Servetus* to be burned alive the day following. *Calvin* and the other ministers of Geneva interceded for a milder death: but the court would not yield. *Servetus* was immediately informed of his sentence, and was greatly overcome. The next day, October 27, 1553, he appeared more composed. *Farell* attended him as a clergyman, and urged him to retract; which he pertinaciously refused. He was conducted to the presence of the court, where his sentence was pronounced in form. He begged for a commutation of the mode of death; and *Farell* also urged the same; but the court would not listen. He was conducted slowly to the place of execution, permitted and even urged to address the people: which he refused. At length, he was fastened by a chain to a stake, seated on a block, and surrounded by combustibles. The fire was kindled, and he expired at the end of half an hour. To the last, he maintained the correctness of the opinions for which he suffered; and cried repeatedly, "Jesus, thou Son of the eternal God, have mercy on me."—At this day, all agree, that *Servetus* ought not to have been put to death: but in that age, different sentiments prevailed. The burning of heretics was then almost universally approved and practised. There were some, however, especially among the French and Italian Protestants, whose exposure on this principle to be themselves put to death by the papists, led them to question the correctness of the principle. *Calvin* therefore, who certainly had some hand in the death of *Servetus*, was censured by a few Protestants; while the great body of them, and even the mild *Melancthon*, fully approved his conduct. Some of the moderns have unjustly charged *Calvin* with being actuated, solely, by personal enmity against Servetus, and by the natural severity of his disposition. On the other hand, some have attempted entirely to exculpate him, and to attribute his conduct to the purest motives. He doubtless thought he was doing right, and had the approbation of his own conscience: as he certainly had of the wisest and best men of that age, who, as occasion was presented, pursued the same course themselves. But had he lived in our age, he would undoubtedly have thought and acted differently. See *Beza's* Life of Calvin, by *Sibson*, ed. Philadelphia, 1836, note c., p. 156-204.—*Tr.*]

to be himself the author, died with him. For notwithstanding public fame ascribed to him many disciples, and not a few divines of that age professed to have great apprehensions from the *sect of Servetus;* yet it may be justly doubted, whether he left behind him one genuine disciple. Those who are called *Servetians* and followers of the doctrine of *Servetus*, by the writers of that age, differed widely from *Servetus* in many respects; and in particular, they entertained very different opinions from his, respecting the doctrine of the divine Trinity. *Valentine Gentilis* of Naples, whom the government of Bern put to death in 1566, did not hold the opinions of *Servetus*, as many writers affirm; but held Arian sentiments, and made the Son and the Holy Spirit to be inferior to the Father.(9) Not much different were the views of *Matthew Gribaldus*, a jurist of Pavia; who was removed by a timely death, at Geneva, in 1566, when about to undergo a capital trial: for he distributed the divine nature into *three Eternal Spirits*, differing in rank, as well as numerically.(10) It is not equally certain what was the criminal error of *Jo. Paul Alciat* a Piedmontese, and of *Sylvester Tellius*, who were banished from Geneva in 1559; or what, that of *Paruta*, *Leonardi*,(11) and others, who are sometimes numbered among the followers of *Servetus:* yet it is not at all probable, that any one of these regarded *Servetus* as his master. *Peter Gonesius* who is said to have introduced the errors of *Servetus* into Poland,(12) although he may

(9) *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire, article *Gentilis;* tom. ii., p. 1251. *Jac. Spon's* Histoire de Geneve, livr. iii., tom. ii., p. 80, &c. *Christ. Sand's* Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar., p. 26. *Lamy's* Histoire du Socinianisme, pt. ii., cap. vi., p. 251. *Jo. Conr. Fuslin's* Reformations-Beyträge, vol. v., p. 381, &c. [*Gentilis* fled his country, from religious motives, about the middle of the century; and settled at Geneva, in connexion with the Italian society there. Here, with others, he uttered anti-trinitarian sentiments; for which he was arraigned in 1558, subscribed to an orthodox confession of faith, and promised under oath, not to leave the city without permission. He however, fled clandestinely; and travelled in France, Switzerland, Germany, and Poland, propagating Arian sentiments. He was imprisoned at Lyons, and at Bern, and was expelled from Poland. In 1566, he came to Bern a second time, was apprehended, and condemned to death, for having obstinately and contrary to his oath assailed the doctrine of the Trinity. See *Bayle*, loc. cit. *Arctius*, a Reformed divine, wrote Historia Val. Gentilis justo capitis supplicio Bernæ affecti; 1617, fol.—*Tr.*]

(10) *Christ. Sand's* Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar., p. 17. *Lamy*, loc. cit., pt. ii., cap. vii., p. 257, &c. *Spon's* Histoire de Geneve, tome ii., p. 85, note. *Haller*, in the Museum Tigurinum, tom. ii., p. 114.

(11) Of these, and other persons of this class, see *Sand*, *Lamy*, and *Stanislaus Lubieniecius*, Historia Reformat. Polonicæ, lib. ii., cap. v., p. 96. Concerning *Alciat* in particular, see *Bayle*, Dictionnaire, tom. i., p. 239. Also, *Spon*, loc. cit., tom. ii., p. 85, 86. [This *Alciat* was a Milanese gentleman, and one of those Italians who fled their country, to join the Protestants; and who afterwards so refined upon the mystery of the Trinity, as to form a new party, equally odious to Protestants and to Catholics. *Alciat* had been a soldier: and he commenced his innovations at Geneva, in concert with a physician named *Blandrata*, and a lawyer named *Gribaud*, (in Latin *Gribaldus*), with whom became associated *Valentine Gentilis*. The precautions taken against them, and the severe procedure against *Gentilis*, intimidated the others, and induced them to seek another residence. They chose Poland; where *Blandrata* and *Alciat* disseminated their heresy with sufficient success. They allured *Gentilis* to come and join them. He was under obligation to *Alciat*, at whose entreaty the bailiff of Gex had let him out of prison. It is said, that from Poland they went to Moravia. *Gentilis* was beheaded at Bern, *Alciat* retired to Dantzic, and there died in the sentiments of Socinus. He wrote two letters to *Gregory Paul*, in 1564 and 1565, in which he maintains that *Christ* had no existence, till he was born of *Mary*. See *Bayle*, loc. cit.—*Tr.*]

(12) This is affirmed by many, who here follow *Wissowatius* and *Stan. Lubieniecius*, Historia Reformat. Polonicæ, cap. vi., p. 111, &c.; but how truly it is affirmed, may

have taught some things akin to them, yet explained the most sacred mystery of the divine trinity, in a very different manner from *Servetus*.

§ 7. No one of those hitherto named, professed that form of religion which is properly called *Socinian*. The Socinian writers, generally, trace the origin of their sect to Italy; and refer it to the year 1546. In this year they tell us, and in the vicinity of Venice, especially at Vicenza, more than forty men eminent no less for genius and erudition than for their love of truth, often assembled together in secret; and they not only consulted on a general reformation in religion, but undertook more especially to refute the doctrines that were afterwards publicly rejected by the Socinian sect. They add, that *Lælius Socinus*, *Alciatus*, *Ochin*, *Paruta*, *Gentilis* and others, stood conspicuous among these persons. But by the imprudence of one of the associates, the temerity of these men became known; two of them were seized and put to death, the others escaped, and fled into Switzerland, Germany, Moravia, and other countries. Among these exiles was *Socinus*, who after various wanderings, passed into Poland in 1551, and again in 1558, and there disseminated the seeds of that scheme of doctrine, which he and his associates had devised in their own country, and which subsequently produced abundant fruits.(13) That this whole representation is a fiction, cannot be maintained: yet it is easily shown, that the system of religion which bears the name of *Socinus*, was by no means fabricated in those meetings at Venice and Vicenza.(14)

be learned from *Lubieniecius* himself, who says of *Gonesius*: "He brought into his country the doctrine of *Servetus* concerning the *pre-eminence of the Father*; which he did not dissemble." But if *Gonesius* taught the *pre-eminence* of the Father, he differed much from *Servetus*, who denied all real distinctions in the divine nature. As to the opinions of *Gonesius*, see *Sand*, loc. cit, p. 40, from whom chiefly *Lamy* borrows his account; Histoire du Socinianisme, tome ii., cap. x, p. 278. [This *Gonesius* was of Podlachia; and studied in Saxony and Switzerland, where he got hold of the writings of *Servetus*. On his return home, he became intimate with some Anabaptists in Moravia: and in the year 1556, he controverted the doctrine of the Trinity, first in a synod of the Polish Reformed, in which he pronounced it a fiction gendered in the human brain. Two years afterwards, he also rejected infant baptism. He likewise spoke contemptuously of civil authorities. See *S. F. Lauterbach's* Polnisch Arianischen Socinianismus.—*Schl.*]

(13) See *Christopher Sand's* Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar., p. 18, who likewise mentions, (on page 25) some writings which are said,—but on altogether questionable authority,—to have been published by those Venetian inventors of the Socinian system. *Andrew Wissowatius*, Narratio, quomodo in Polonia Reformati ab Unitariis separati sunt; subjoined to *Sand*, p. 209, 210. *Stanislaus Lubieniecius*, Historia reformationis Polonicæ, lib. ii., cap. i., p. 38, who says he derived this account from the Commentaries of *Budzinius*, never published, and from the life of *Lælius Socinus*. See also *Sam. Przipcovius*, Vita Socini; and others.

(14) The late *Gustavus George Zeltner*, in his Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfini, cap. ii., § 41, note, p. 321, wished to have the truth of this story more accurately examined by the learned. Till this is done, we will here offer a few remarks, which will perhaps throw some light on the subject. In the thing itself, in my judgment, there is nothing incredible. It appears from many documents, that after the reformation commenced in Germany, many persons in various countries subject to the Romish see, consulted together respecting the abolition of superstition: and it is the more probable that this was done by some learned men in the Venetian territory, as it is well known that, in that age there were living among the Venetians a considerable number of men who wished well, if not to *Luther* himself, yet to his design of reforming religion and restoring it to its native simplicity. It is likewise easy to believe, that these consultations were interrupted by the vigilance of the satellites of Rome; and that some of those concerned in them, were arrested and put to death; and that others saved themselves by flight. But it is very doubtful, nay incredible, that all those persons were at these consultations, who are

§ 8. We can give a more certain account of the origin and progress of Socinian principles in religion. As not only the papists but also the Lutherans and the Swiss were every where watchful, to prevent both *Anabaptists*, and the opposers of the glory of Jesus Christ and the triune God, from gaining any where a permanent habitation, a large number of this sort of people retired to Poland, supposing that a nation so strongly attached to liberty in general, would not disapprove liberty of opinion in religious matters. Here they at first cautiously disclosed their views, being timid and doubtful, what would be the issue. Hence, for a number of years they lived intermixed with the Lutherans and Calvinists, who had acquired a firm establishment in Poland; nor were they excluded either from their communion in worship, or from their deliberative bodies. But

reported to have borne a part in them. Indeed I am of opinion, that many of those who afterwards obtained celebrity by opposing the Christian doctrine of a Trinity in the Godhead, are rashly placed by incompetent judges in the list of members of such a Venetian association, because they have supposed, that this was the parent and the cradle of the whole *Unitarian* sect. This at least I certainly know, that *Ochin* must be excluded from it. For, not to mention that it is uncertain whether he has been justly or unjustly ranked among Socinians, it is clear from *Zach. Boverius*, Annales Capucinorum, and from other unquestionable testimonies, that he left Italy and removed to Geneva, as early as the year 1543. See La Guerre Seraphique ou l'Histoire des perils, qu' a courus la barbe des Capucins, livr. iii., p. 191, 216, &c. Respecting *Lælius Socinus* himself, who is represented as at the head of the association in question, I would confidently assert the same as of *Ochin*, [namely, that he is unjustly placed among the members of this association.] For who can believe, that a young man only twenty-one years old, (for such was *Lælius* at that time), left his native country, and repaired to Venice or Vicenza, to have a free discussion with others relative to the general interests of religion; and that this youth had such influence, as to obtain the first rank in a numerous body of men distinguished for talent and learning? Besides, from the life of *Lælius*, and from other testimonies, it can be proved, that he retired from Italy, not to escape impending danger to his life, but for the sake of improvement, and to acquire a knowledge of the truth among foreign nations. He certainly returned afterwards to his own country; and in 1551, resided some time at Sienna, while his father resided at Bologna. See his letter to *Bullinger*, in the Museum Helveticum, tom. v., p. 489, &c. Who can suppose the man would have undertaken such a journey, if but a few years previous he had with difficulty escaped from the hands of the inquisitors and a capital punishment?

But, supposing all the rest to be true, which the Socinians tell us respecting the members and the character of this Venetian association, which had for its object the disrobing our Saviour of his divine majesty; yet this we can never concede to them, that the Socinian system of doctrine was invented and drawn up in that association. It was unquestionably of later origin; and was long under the correcting and improving hand of many ingenious men, before it acquired its complete and permanent form. If any one wishes for proof of this, let him only look at the doctrines and reasonings of some of those who are said to have been members of the association in question, which he will find to have been exceedingly diversified. It appears from many facts reported in various documents concerning *Lælius Socinus*, that *his* mind had not yet become established in any definite system of religious doctrine, at the time he left Italy; and that he spent many years, subsequently to that period, in inquiring, doubting, examining, and discussing. And I could almost believe, that he finally died, still hesitating what to believe on various points. *Gribaldus* and *Alciat*, of whom notice has already been taken, were inclined to *Arian* views; and had not so low an opinion of our Saviour, as the Socinians had. These examples fully show, that those Italian reformers (if they really existed, which I here assume, but do not affirm), had come to no fixed conclusions; but were dispersed, and compelled to go into exile, before they had come to be of one opinion on points of the highest importance in religion.—This account of the origin of Socinianism, which many inconsiderately adopt, has also been objected to, by *Jo. Conr. Füslin*, Reformations-Beyträgen, tom. iii., p. 327, &c.

after acquiring the friendship of some of the noble and opulent, they ventured to act more courageously, and to attack openly the common views of Christians. Hence originated, first, violent contests with the Swiss [or Reformed], with whom they were principally connected; the issue of which at last was, that in the Synod of Petrikow, A.D. 1565, they were required to secede, and to form themselves into a separate community.(15) These founders of the Socinian sect, were commonly called *Pinczovians*, from the town [of Pinczow] where the leaders of the sect resided. The greatest part of these, however, professed Arian sentiments respecting the divine nature; representing the Son and the Holy Spirit to be persons begotten by the one God the Father, and inferior to him.(16)

§ 9. As soon as the *Unitarians* became separated from the other communities of Christians in Poland, they had to conflict with many difficulties, both internal and external. Without, they were oppressed, both by the papists and by the Reformed and Lutherans: within, there was danger lest the feeble flock should become torn by factions. For they had not yet agreed upon any common formula of faith. Some continued still to adhere to Arian views, and were called *Farnovians*.(17) Others chose to go farther, and to ascribe almost nothing to Christ but the prerogatives of an ambassador of God. The worst of these were the *Budneians;* who maintained, that *Christ* was born just as all other men are, and therefore was unworthy of any divine worship or adoration.(18) Nor were they free from superstitious persons, who wished to introduce among them the practical notions of the Anabaptists; namely, a community of goods, a universal equality in rank and power, and other things of the like nature.(19) From these troubles however, they were happily soon relieved, by the per-

(15) *Lamy*, Histoire du Socinianisme, pt. i., cap. vi., vii., viii., &c., p. 16, &c. *Jo. Stoicnsky* (*Stoinii*), Epitome originis Unitariorum in Polonia; in *Sand*, p. 183, &c. *Geo. Schomann's* Testamentum; ibid., p. 194. *Andrew Wissowatius*, de separatione Unitariorum a Reformatis; ibid., p. 211, 212. *Stanisl. Lubieniecius*, Historia reformat. Polonicæ, lib. ii., cap. vi., &c., p. 111, &c.; cap. viii., p. 144; lib. iii., cap. i., p. 158, &c. [Among the Polish Antitrinitarians must also be reckoned the Frenchman *Peter Statorius;* who came to Poland in 1559, and was rector of the school at Pinczow. To the same party, *Gregory Pauli* a Pole, afterwards joined himself. He had taught with great reputation, in the Reformed church at Cracow; was deposed on account of his erroneous opinions, and then openly associated himself with the Unitarians. The Stancarian controversy contributed most to the discovery of the error of these people in regard to the Trinity. For many synods and conferences being held on that controversy, the Unitarians exposed themselves in them, and thus awakened the zeal of believers in the Trinity to oppose them in the debates. In the years 1564 and 1566, appeared the first royal edicts against the Unitarians; by which they were banished the realm. *Valentine Gentilis* therefore, retired to Switzerland; and *Jo. Paul Alciat*, to Prussia. Others found concealed retreats with some of the nobles, till they could openly appear again in public. Under the same protection and patronage, they at length obtained churches, schools, and printing establishments of their own.—*Schl.*]

(16) This will readily appear, to one who shall attentively peruse the writers just quoted. It is indeed true, that all who then bore the name of *Unitarian Brethren*, did not hold precisely the same opinion respecting the divine nature. Some of the principal doctors among them were inclined towards those views of Jesus Christ, which afterwards were the common views of the Socinian sect: but the greater part of them agreed with the Arians, and affirmed that our Saviour was produced by God the Father before the foundation of the world, but that he was greatly inferior to the Father.

(17) [Concerning these, see below, § 24 of this chapter, p. 242.—*Tr.*]

(18) Vita Andr. Wissowatii; subjoined to *Sand's* Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar., p. 226, and *Sand* himself, on Simon Budnæus, p. 54.

(19) *Lubieniecius*, Historia reformationis Polonicæ, lib. iii., cap. xii., p. 240.

severance and authority of certain teachers; whose plans were so successful that in a short time they reduced those factions to narrow limits, established flourishing churches at Cracow, Lublin, Pinczow, Lucklavitz, and especially at Smigla, a town which lay in the territories of the famous *Andrew Dudith*,(20) and in many other places both in Poland and in Lithuania; and moreover obtained license, to publish books in two different towns.(21) These privileges were crowned by *John Sienienius* [*Sienienszky*], the waiwode of Podolia; who granted them a residence in his new town of Racovia [Racow], in the district of Sendomir, which he built in 1569.(22) After obtaining this residence, the sect which was dispersed far and wide among their enemies, supposing they had now obtained a fixed and permanent location for their religion, did not hesitate to make this place [Racow] the established centre of their church and community.

§ 10. The first care of the leaders of their church after they saw their affairs in this settled state, was to translate the holy scriptures into the Polish language; the publication of which took place in 1572. They previously had a Polish translation of the Bible, which they had made in 1565, conjointly with the Reformed, to whose church they then belonged. But this, after they were ordered to separate themselves from the Reform-

(20) See *Mart. Adelt's* Historia Arianismi Smiglensis. Dantzig, 1741, 8vo. ["This *Dudith*, who was certainly one of the most learned and eminent men of the sixteenth century, was born at Buda, in the year 1533; and after having studied in the most famous universities, and travelled through almost all the countries of Europe," (visiting England in 1554, in the suite of Cardinal *Pole*), "was named to the bishopric of Tinia, by the emperor *Ferdinand*, and made privy counsellor to that prince. He had, by the force of his genius and the study of the ancient orators, acquired such a masterly and irresistible eloquence, that in all public deliberations he carried every thing before him. In the council" (of Trent), "where he was sent, in the name of the emperor and of the Hungarian clergy, he spoke with such energy against several abuses of the church of Rome, and particularly against the celibacy of the clergy, that the pope, being informed thereof by his legates, solicited the emperor to recall him. *Ferdinand* complied; but having heard *Dudith's* report of what passed in that famous council, he approved of his conduct, and rewarded him with the bishopric of Chonat. He afterwards married a maid of honour of the queen of Hungary, and resigned his bishopric; the emperor, however, still continued his friend and protector. The papal excommunication was levelled at his head, but he treated it with contempt. Tired of the fopperies and superstitions of the church of Rome, he retired to Cracow, where he embraced the Protestant religion publicly, after having been for a good while its secret friend. It is said, that he showed some inclination towards the Socinian system. Some of his friends deny this; others confess it, but maintain that he afterwards changed his sentiments in that respect. He was well acquainted with several branches of philosophy and the mathematics, with the sciences of physic, history, theology, and the civil law. He was such an enthusiastical admirer of *Cicero*, that he copied over three times, with his own hand, the whole works of that immortal author. He had something majestic in his figure, and in the air of his countenance. His life was regular and virtuous, his manners elegant and easy, and his benevolence warm and extensive."—*Mael.* See *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Reformat., vol. ii, p. 738, &c, and *Rees'* Cyclopædia, article *Dudith.* —*Tr.*]

(21) *Sand's* Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar., p. 201.

(22) *Sand*, loc. cit., p. 201. *Lubieniecius*, loc cit., p. 239, &c. [Here all the most famous Unitarians were established as teachers: here they set up in 1602, a school which they called Athenæ Sarmaticæ, in which the number of students often exceeded 1000, and which was attended even by Catholics, because the mode of teaching was the same as that of the Jesuits, and no one was solicited to change his religion. Here also they had, next to that at Lublin and one in Lithuania, their most famous printing establishment, first the Radeckish and then the Sternackish, till the year 1638, from which so many works of the Unitarians were issued.—*Schl.*]

ed, they considered not well suited to their condition.(23) In the next place, they drew up and published a small work, containing the principal articles of their religious faith. This was in the year 1574; at which time the first *Catechism* and *Confession* of the *Unitarians* was printed at Cracow.(24) The system of religion contained in this book, is extremely

(23) See *Dav. Ringeltaube*, von den Pohlnischen Bibeln, p. 90, 113, 142, who gives farther information respecting Polish translations of the Bible by Socinians.

(24) This little work, from which alone the character of the *Unitarian* theology anterior to the times of *Faustus Socinus*, can be learned with certainty, is not mentioned, so far as I know, by any *Unitarian* author, nor by any one who has either written their history or opposed their doctrine. I am ready to believe that the Socinians themselves, afterwards, when they had acquired more dexterity and power, and had shaped their theology more artificially, wisely took care to have the copies of this Confession destroyed; lest they should fall under the charge of fickleness and of abandoning the tenets of their predecessors, or incur the charge of forsaking their ancient simplicity, which is apt to produce divisions and parties. It will therefore be doing service to the history of Christian doctrine, to describe here summarily, the form and character of this first Socinian creed, which was set forth prior to the *Racovian Catechism*. This very rare book is quite a small one, and bears the following title: Catechesis et Confessio fidei cœtus per Poloniam congregati in nomine Jesu Christi Domini nostri crucifixi et resuscitati. Deuterono. vi. Audi Israel, Dominus Deus noster Deus unus est. Johannis VIII. dicit Jesus: Quem vos dicitis vestrum esse Deum, est pater meus. Typis Alexandri Turobini, anno nati Jesu Christi, filii Dei 1574, pp. 160, 12mo. That it was printed at Cracow, appears from the close of the preface, which is dated in this city, in the year 1574, post Jesum Christum natum. The *Unitarians* then had a printing-office at Cracow, which was soon after removed to Racow. The *Alexander Turobinus*, who is said to be the printer, is called *Turobinczyck*, by *Christ. Sand.* (Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar., p. 51), and undoubtedly derived his name from his native place, *Turobin*, in the district of Chelm in Red Russia. That the author of the book was the noted *George Schomann* has been proved from *Schomann's* Testamentum, published by *Sand*, and from other documents, by *Jo. Adam Muller*; who gives a particular account of *Schomann*, in his Essay, de Unitariorum Catechesi et Confessione omnium prima, written since my remarks on the subject; and which is printed in *Bartholomew's* Fortgesetzten nützlichen Anmerckungen von allerhand Materien; vol. xxi., p. 758. The preface, composed in the name of the whole association, begins with this salutation: Omnibus salutem æternam sitientibus, gratiam et pacem ab uno illo altissimo Deo patre, per unigenitum ejus filium Dominum nostrum, Jesum Christum crucifixum, ex animo precatur *cœtus exiguus et afflictus* per Poloniam, in nomine ejusdem Jesu Christi Nazareni baptizatus. Their reasons for writing and publishing the book, are thus stated; namely, the reproaches, which in one place and another are cast upon the *Anabaptists*. Hence it appears, that the people who were afterwards called *Socinians*, were in that age denominated *Anabaptists:* nor did they reject this appellation, but tacitly admitted it. The remainder of the short preface consists of entreaties to the readers, to regard the whole as written in good faith, to read and judge for themselves, and, *forsaking the doctrine of Babylon, and the conduct and conversation of Sodom, to take refuge in the ark of Noah*; i. e., among the *Unitarians*. In the commencement of the book, the whole of the Christian religion is reduced to six heads: I. *of God and Jesus Christ*;—II. *of justification*;—III. *of discipline*;—IV. *of prayer*;—V. *of baptism*;—VI. *of the Lord's supper*. And these six topics are then explained successively, by first giving a long and full answer or exposition of each; and then dividing them into subordinate questions or members, and subjoining answers with scripture proofs annexed. It is manifest even from this performance, that the infancy of the Socinian theology was very feeble and imbecile; that its teachers were not distinguished for a deep and accurate knowledge of divine things; and that they imbued their flocks with only a few and very simple precepts. In their description of God, which comes first in order, the authors at once let out their views concerning *Jesus Christ*; for they inculcate that he, together with all creatures, *is subject* to God. It is also noticeable, that they make no mention of God's infinity, his omniscience, his immensity, his eternity, his omnipotence, his omnipresence, his perfect simplicity, and the other attributes of the Supreme Being, which are above human comprehension: but merely exalt God for his wisdom, his immortality, his goodness, and his supreme

simple, and free from all subtilties: yet it bears altogether a Socinian aspect, in regard to the points most essential to that system. Nor will this

dominion over all things. It would seem therefore, that the leaders of the community, even then, believed that nothing is to be admitted in theology, which human reason cannot fully comprehend and understand. Their erroneous views of our Saviour, are thus expressed: *Our mediator with God, is a man, who was anciently promised to the fathers by the prophets, and in these latter days was born of the seed of David, whom God the Father hath made Lord and Christ, that is, the most perfect prophet, the most holy priest, and the most invincible king, by whom he created the new world,* (for those declarations of the sacred volume, which represent the whole material universe as created by our Saviour, they maintain, as the Socinians do, to be figurative; and understand them to refer to the restoration of mankind; so that they may not be compelled unwillingly to admit his divine power and glory), *restored all things, reconciled them to himself, made peace, and bestowed eternal life upon his elect: to the end that, next to the most high God, we should believe in him, adore him, pray to him, imitate him according to our ability, and find rest to our souls in him.*(a) Although they here call Jesus Christ *the most holy priest*, which they afterwards confirm with passages of scripture, yet they no where explain the nature of that priesthood which they ascribe to him. The Holy Spirit, they most explicitly declare, not to be a divine *person*, and they represent him as a divine power or energy: *The Holy Spirit is the power of God, the fulness of which God the Father hath bestowed on his only begotten Son, our Lord; that we being adopted, might receive of his fulness.*(b) Their opinion of *justification* is thus expressed: *Justification is the remission of all our past sins, from mere grace, through our Lord Jesus Christ, without our works and merits, in a lively faith; and the unhesitating expectation of eternal life; and a real, not a feigned amendment of life, by the aid of the Spirit of God, to the glory of God our Father, and the edification of our neighbours.*(c) As they make *justification* to consist in a great measure in a *reformation* of the life, so in the explanation of this general account, they introduce a part of their doctrine of morals; which is contained in a very few precepts, and those expressed almost wholly in the words of the scriptures. Their system of morality has these peculiarities, that it forbids *taking an oath*, and *the repelling of injuries.* They define *ecclesiastical discipline* thus: *It is the frequent reminding individuals of their duty; and the admonition of such as sin against God or their neighbour, first privately, and then also publicly before the whole assembly; and finally, the rejection of the pertinacious from the communion of saints, that so being ashamed they may repent, or if they will not repent, may be damned eternally.*(d) Their explanation of this point, shows how incomplete and imperfect were their ideas on the subject. For they first treat of the government of the Christian church, and of the ministers of religion, whom they divide into *bishops, deacons, elders* or *presbyters*, and *widows*: they next enumerate the duties of husbands and wives, the aged and the young, parents and children, servants and masters, citizens towards magistrates, the rich and the poor: and lastly, they treat of admonishing sinners first, and then depriving them of communion if they will not reform. Respecting *prayer*, their precepts are in general sound and good. But on the subject of *baptism*, they differ from other Christians in this, that they make it to consist in *immersion and emersion*, and allow it to be administered only to adults. *Baptism*, say they, *is the immersion in water, and the emersion, of a person who believes the gospel and exercises repentance, in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, or in the name of Jesus Christ; whereby he publicly professes, that by the grace of God the Father, he has been washed in the blood of Christ, by the aid of the Holy Spirit, from all his sins; so that, being ingrafted into the body of Christ, he may*

(a) Est homo, mediator noster apud Deum, patribus olim per prophetas promissus et ultimis tandem temporibus ex Davidis semine natus, quem Deus pater fecit Dominum et Christum, hoc est, perfectissimum prophetam, sanctissimum sacerdotem, invictissimum regem, per quem novum mundum creavit, omnia restauravit, secum reconciliavit, pacifi avit, et vitam æternam electis suis donavit; ut in illum, post Deum altissimum, credamus, illum adoremus, invoc mus, audiamus, pro modulo nostro imitemur, et in illo requiem animabus nostris inveniamus.

(b) Spiritus sanctus est virtus Dei, cuju- plenitudinem dedit Deus pater filio suo unigenito, Domino nostro, ut nos adoptivi ex plenitudine ejus acciperemus.

(c) Justificatio est ex mera gratia, per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, sine operibus et meritis nostris, omnium præteritorum peccatorum nostrorum in viva fide remissio, vitæque æternæ indubitata expectatio, et auxilio spiritus Dei vitæ nostræ non simulata, sed vera correctio, ad gloriam Dei patris et ædificationem proximorum nostrorum.

(d) Disciplina ecclesiastica est officii singulorum frequens commemoratio, et peccantium contra Deum vel proximum primum privata, deinde etiam publica, coram toto cœtu, commonefictio, denique pertinacium a communione sanctorum alienatio, ut pudore suffusi convertantur, aut si id nolint, æternum damnentur.

surprise us, if we consider that the papers of *Lælius Socinus*, (which he undoubtedly left in Poland), were in the hands of a great many persons; and by these, the Arians who had formerly had the upper hand, were led to change their opinion respecting *Jesus Christ*.(25) The name *Socinians* was not yet known. Those who afterwards bore this name, were then usually called by the Poles *Anabaptists;* because in their churches they admitted none to baptism but adults, and were accustomed to rebaptize such as came over to them from other communities.(26)

§ 11. The affairs of the *Unitarians* assumed a new aspect, under the dexterity and industry of *Faustus Socinus;* a man of superior genius, of moderate learning, of a firm and resolute spirit, less erudite than his uncle *Lælius*, but more bold and courageous. When, after various wanderings, he first arrived among the Polish *Unitarians* in 1579, he met with much trouble and opposition from very many, who accounted some of his opinions wide of the truth. And in reality the religious system of *Faustus*, (which he is said to have derived from the papers left by *Lælius*), had much less simplicity than that of the *Unitarians*. Nevertheless, by his wealth, his eloquence, his abilities as a writer, the patronage of the great, the elegance of his manners, and other advantages which he possessed, he overcame at length all difficulties, and by seasonably yielding at one time,

mortify the old Adam, and be transformed into the celestial Adam, in the firm assurance of eternal life after the resurrection (e) Lastly, concerning the *Lord's supper*, they give such a representation, as a Zwinglian would readily admit. At the end of the book, is added, *Œconomiu Christiana, seu pastoratus domesticus;* that is, brief instructions, how the heads of families should preserve and maintain piety and the fear of God in their houses; and containing also forms of prayers, to be used morning and evening, and at other times. The copy of this *Catechism*, which I now possess, was presented by *Martin Chelm*, (whom the Socinians name among the first patrons of their church), to *M. Christopher Heiligmeier*, in the year 1580; as appears from a long inscription, at the end of the book. *Chelm* there promises his friend, other writings of the same kind, if this should be received cheerfully and kindly: and concludes with these words of *St. Paul;* Infirma mundi elegit Deus, ut fortia confundat.

(25) This we are clearly taught, by *George Schomann*, in his Testamentum, published by *Sand*, p. 194, 195. Sub id fere tempus (A.D. 1566) ex rhapsodiis *Lælii Socini* quidam fratres didicerunt, Dei filium non esse secundam Trinitatis personam patri coëssentialem et coæqualem, sed hominem Jesum Christum, ex Spiritu Sancto conceptum, ex virgine Maria natum, crucifixum et resuscitatum: a quibus nos commoniti, sacras litteras perscrutari, persuasi sumus. These words most clearly show, that the *Pinczovians*, (as they were called), before they separated from the Reformed in 1565, professed to believe in a *Trinity* of some sort, and did not divest Jesus Christ of all divinity. For this *Schomann* was a doctor of great authority among them; and in the year 1565, (as he himself informs us), at the convention of Petricow, he contended (pro uno Deo patri) *for one God the Father*, in opposition to the Reformed, who, he says, (Deum trinum defendebant), *maintained a threefold God*. Yet in the following year, he, with others, was induced by the papers of *Lælius Socinus*, to so alter his sentiments, that he denied Christ to be a *divine* person. He therefore, with his Pinczovian flock, before this time, must necessarily have been, not a Socinian, but an Arian.

(26) This the *Unitarians* themselves attest, in the Preface to their *Catechism*, as we have observed above: and it is confirmed by the author of the Epistola de vita Andr. Wissowatii, subjoined to *Sand's* Bibliotheca. For he says, (p. 225), that his sect bore the name of *Arians* and of *Anabaptists;* but that the other Christians in Poland were all, promiscuously, called *Chrzescians*, from *Chzrest, which denotes baptism.*

(e) Baptismus est hominis Evangelio credentis, et pœnitentiam agentis, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, vel in nomine Jesu Christi, in aquam immersio et emersio, qua publice profitetur, se gratia Dei patris, in sanguine Christi, opera Spiritus sancti, ab omnibus peccatis ablutum esse, ut in corpus Christi insertus, mortificet veterem Adamum, et transformetur in Adamum illum cœlestem, certus, se post resurrectionem consequuturum esse vitam æternam.

and contesting at another, he brought the whole *Unitarian* people to surrender to those opinions of his which they had before contemned, and to coalesce and become one community.(27)

§ 12. Through his influence therefore, the ill-digested, dubious, and unpolished religion of the old *Unitarians*, became greatly altered, was more ingeniously stated, and more artfully and dexterously defended.(28) Under the guidance of so spirited and respectable a leader, the company likewise, which before was a little feeble flock, rose in a short time to distinction and honour, by the accession to it of great numbers, of all orders and classes, among whom were many persons of illustrious birth, of opulence, influence, eloquence, and learning. Of these, some helped forward the growing church by their wealth and influence, and others by their pens and their genius; and they boldly resisted the enemies, whom the prosperity of the community every where called forth. The Unitarian religion, thus new modelled and made almost a new system, required a new *Confession* of faith to set forth its principles. Therefore, laying aside the old *Catechism*, which was but a rude and ill-digested work, *Socinus* himself drew up a new religious summary; which being corrected by some, and enlarged by others, resulted at last in that celebrated work, which is usually called the *Racovian Catechism*, and which is accounted the common creed of the whole sect. The ship seemed now to have reached the port, when *James a Sienno* lord of Racow, in the year 1600, renounced the Reformed religion and came over to this sect, and two years afterwards caused a famous school, intended for a seminary of the church, to be established in his own city which he had rendered the metropolis of the Socinian community.(29)

§ 13. In the year 1563, the doctrines of the Socinians were carried from Poland into the neighbouring Transylvania, by means especially of *George Blandrata;* whose exquisite skill in the medical art induced *John Sigismund* at that time prince of Transylvania, to send for him, and make

(27) See *Bayle*, Dictionnaire, article Socinus, tom. iv., p. 2741. *Sand's* Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar., p. 64. *Sam. Przypcovius*, Vita Socini; prefixed to his works. *Lamy*, Histoire du Socinianisme, pt. i., cap. xxiv., p. 101, &c.; pt. ii., cap. xxii., p. 375, &c., and many others.

(28) It is therefore manifest, that the modern *Unitarians* are, with great propriety, called *Socinians*. For the glory of bringing their sect to establishment and order, (if we may use the word *glory*, of what has little glory attached to it), belongs exclusively to the two *Socini*. *Lælius* indeed, who was naturally timid, died in the bloom of life, at Zurich in 1562, a professed member of the Reformed church; for he would not, by setting up a new sect, subvert his own tranquillity. And there are probable grounds for supposing, that he had not brought to perfection that system of religion which he struck out; and that he died in a state of uncertainty and doubt, respecting many points of no small importance. Yet it was he, who collected the materials which *Faustus* afterwards used; he secretly injected scruples into the minds of many; and, by the arguments against the divinity of our Saviour which he committed to paper, he induced the Arians of Poland, even after he was dead, unhesitatingly to unite themselves with those who maintained Christ to be only a man on a level with Adam, that is, one whom God created. What *Lælius* left unfinished, *Faustus*, beyond controversy, completed and put to use. Yet what part he received from his uncle, and what he added of his own, (for he certainly added not a little), it is very difficult to ascertain. Because only a few of the writings of *Lælius* are extant; and of those of which he is said to be the author, some ought undoubtedly to be attributed to others. This however we know, from the testimony of *Faustus* himself, that what he taught respecting the *person of Jesus Christ*, was for the most part excogitated by *Lælius*.

(29) See *Wissowatius*, Narratio de separatione Unitariorum a Reformatis, p. 214. *Lubieniecius*, Historia reformat. Polonicæ, lib. iii., cap. xii., p. 240, &c.

him his own physician. For this *Blandrata*, possessing intelligence and address, and especially in court affairs, with the aid of *Francis David* whom he took along with him, did not cease to urge the prince himself as well as most of the leading men, until he had infected the whole province with his sentiments, and had procured for his adherents the liberty of publicly professing and teaching his doctrines. The *Bathori* indeed, whom the suffrages of the nobles afterwards created dukes of Transylvania, were by no means favourable to Socinian principles; but they were utterly unable to suppress the numerous and powerful sect.(30) Nor were the lords of Transylvania who succeeded the *Bathori*, able to effect it. Hence, to the present time, in this one province, the Socinians, by virtue of the public laws and of certain compacts, enjoy their schools and houses of worship and keep up their public meetings, though in the midst of continual snares.(31) About the same time, this sect attempted to occupy a portion of Hungary.(32) and of Austria.(33) But the united efforts of the papists and the followers of the Reformed religion, rendered these attempts abortive.

§ 14. The Socinians having obtained a stable domicil for their fortunes at Racow, and being sustained by patrons and friends of great authority and talent, began zealously to seek the enlargement of their church, and the propagation of their religion through all Europe. Hence, in the first place, they procured a large number of books to be composed by their brightest geniuses, some explaining and defending their religious principles, and others expounding, or rather perverting the sacred scriptures according to the views of their sect; and these books, they printed at Racow, and dispersed every where.(34) In the next place, near the close of the century, as appears incontrovertibly from many documents, they sent their emissaries into various countries to make proselytes and to establish new congregations. But these envoys, though some of them had the advantages of a noble birth, and others possessed extensive learning and acuteness in reasoning, were almost every where unsuccessful. A small

(30) See *Sand's* Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar., p. 28 and 55. *Paul Debrezenius*, Historia ecclesiæ reformatæ in Hungaria, p. 147, &c. *Martin Schmeizel*, de statu ecclesiæ Lutheran. in Transylvania, p. 55. *Lamy*, Histoire du Socinianisme, pt. i., cap. xiii., &c., p. 46, &c. *Chr. Aug. Salig's* Hist. der Augsburg. Confession, vol. ii., book vi., ch vii., p. 847, &c. [In the year 1568, the Unitarians held a disputation with the Trinitarians at Weisenburg (in Transylvania), which was continued to the tenth day; and of which, *George Blandrata*, there and in the same year, published his Brevis enarratio disputationis Albanæ: and *Casper Helt* did the same, at Clausenburg, in the name of the Reformed. At the close of the debate, the Unitarians obtained from the nobles who had been on the spot, all the privileges enjoyed by the Evangelical. They also got possession of the cathedral church of Clausenburg; filled the offices of instruction in the schools with Unitarians; and controlled all things according to their pleasure. Under *Stephen Bathori*, *Francis David* went so far as to oppose the offering of prayer to Christ. To reduce him, *Blandrata* called *Faustus Socinus* from Basil, in 1578; and he so persecuted *David*, that the latter was condemned in 1579, to perpetual imprisonment; in which he ended his days.—*Schl.*]

(31) *Gustavus Geo. Zeltner's* Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfini, cap. ii., p. 357, 359. [See also *Dr. Walch's* Neueste Religionsgesch., vol. v., No. 3.—*Schl.*]

(32) *Debrezenius*, Historia ecclesiæ reform. in Hungaria, p. 169, &c.

(33) *Henry Spondanus*, Continuatio Annalium Baronii, ad ann. 1568, No. xxiv., p. 704.

(34) A considerable part of these books was edited in the collection, entitled Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum, printed A.D. 1656, in 6 vols. fol. The collection indeed leaves out many of the productions of the first founders of the sect; yet it is quite sufficient to acquaint us with the genius and character of the sect.

company of Socinians existed in obscurity at Dantzic, for a time; but it seems gradually to have disappeared with this century.(35) In Holland, first *Erasmus Johannes* [or *Jansen*] (36) and afterwards *Andrew Voidovius* and *Christopher Ostorodt*, great pillars of the sect, laboured to gain disciples and followers: nor were they wholly without success. But the vigilance of the theologians and the magistrates, prevented their acquiring strength and establishing associations.(37) Nor did the Socinians find the Britons more accommodating. In Germany, *Adam Neuser* and some others, at the time when the prospects of the *Unitarians* were dark and dubious in Poland, entering into a confederacy with the Transylvanians, contaminated the Palatinate with the errors of this sect: but the mischievous design was seasonably detected and frustrated. *Neuser* then retired among the Turks, and enlisted among the Janizaries at Constantinople.(38)

§ 15. Although the Socinians profess to believe that all knowledge of divine things must be derived from the sacred books of Christians, yet in reality they hold, that the sense of the divine volume must be estimated and explained in conformity with the dictates of right reason: and of course they subject religious truth in some measure, to the empire of reason. For they intimate, sometimes tacitly and sometimes expressly, that the inspired writers frequently slipped, through defects both of memory and of capacity; that they express the conceptions of their minds, in language that is not sufficiently clear and explicit; that they obscure plain subjects, by Asiatic phraseology, that is, by inflated and extravagant expressions; and therefore they must be made intelligible, by the aid of reason and sagacity. From such propositions, any person of tolerable understanding, would readily infer that in general, the history of the Jews and of our Saviour, may be learned from the books of the Old and New Testaments; and that there is no reason to question the truth generally of this *history;* but that the *doctrines* which are set forth in these books, must be so understood and explained, as not to appear contrary to the common apprehensions of men or to human reason. The divinely-inspired books, therefore, do not declare what views we should have concerning God and his counsels; but human sagacity it is, that points out to us what system of religion we are to search for in the scriptures.

§ 16. This opinion becomes still worse, when we consider what this sect understood by the term reason. For by the splendid name of *right reason*, they appear to mean that measure of intelligence, or that power of comprehending and understanding things, which we derive from nature. And hence the fundamental maxim of the whole Socinian theology, is this: Nothing must be admitted as a divine doctrine, but what the human mind

(35) *Gustavus Geo. Zeltner's* Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfini, p. 199, note.

(36) See *Sand's* Biblioth., p. 87.

(37) *Zeltner*, loc. cit., p. 31 and 178. [" *Brandt.* in his History of the Reformation in the Netherlands, tells us, that *Ostorodt* and *Voidovius* were banished, and that their books were condemned to be burned publicly by the hands of the common hangman. Accordingly the pile was raised, the executioner approached, and the multitude was assembled, but the books did not appear. The magistrates, who were curious to peruse their contents, had quietly divided them among themselves and their friends."—*Macl.*]

(38) *Burch. Gotth. Struve's* Pfälzische Kirchenhist., ch. v., sec. 53. p. 214. *Henr. Alting's* Historia Eccles. Palatin. in *Meigs'* Monumenta Palatina, p. 266. &c., 337. *Matur. Veysse la Croze*, Dissertations Historiques, tome i., p 101. 127. Compare *Bern. Raupach's* Presbyterologia Austriaca, p. 113, &c., where he treats of *John Matthæi*, who was implicated in these commotions.

can fully *understand* and *comprehend:* and whatever the holy scriptures teach, concerning the nature of God, his counsels and purposes, and the way of salvation, must be filed down and polished by art and reason, till it shall agree with the capacities of our minds.(39) Whoever admits this, must also admit, that there may be as many religions as there are people. For as one person is more obtuse than another, or more acute, so also what is plain and easy of comprehension to one, another will complain of as abstruse and hard to be understood. Neither do the Socinians appear to fear this consequence very greatly: for they allow their people to explain variously, many doctrines of the greatest importance, provided they entertain no doubts respecting the general credibility of the history of Jesus Christ, and hold what the scriptures inculcate in regard to morals and conduct.

§ 17. Proceeding on this maxim, the Socinians either reject or bring down to their comprehension, whatever presents any difficulty to the human mind, in the doctrine concerning God, and the Son of God, Jesus Christ, or concerning the nature of man, or the entire plan of salvation as proposed by the inspired writers, or concerning the doctrine of eternal rewards and punishments. God is indeed vastly more perfect than men are, yet he is not altogether unlike them: by that power with which he controls all nature, he caused *Jesus Christ*, an extraordinary man, to be born of the virgin *Mary:* this man he caught up to heaven, imbued him with a portion of his own energy, which is called the Holy Spirit, and with a full knowledge of his will; and then sent him back to this world, that he might promulgate to mankind a new rule of life, more perfect than the old one, and might evince the truth of his doctrine by his life and his death. Those who obey the voice of this divine teacher,—and all *can* obey it, if they are so disposed,—being clad in other bodies, shall hereafter for ever inhabit the blessed abode where God resides: those who do otherwise, being consumed by exquisite torments, will at length sink into entire annihilation. These few propositions contain the whole system of Socinian theology, when divested of the decorations and subtle argumentations of their theologians.

§ 18. The general character of the Socinian theology, requires them to limit their moral precepts entirely to external duties and conduct. For while they deny on the one hand, that men's minds are purified by a divine influence; and on the other, that any man can so control himself as wholly to extinguish his evil propensities and passions; no alternative is left, but to hold *him* to be a holy man, who lives agreeably to those pre-

(39) [*Dr. Ziegler*, in his condensed View of the peculiar doctrines of *Faustus Socinus*, (in *Henke's* Neuen Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, &c., vol. iv., st. ii., p. 204. &c.), controverts this statement of *Mosheim;* and maintains, that *Socinus* aimed to base his doctrines wholly on the scriptures, and not on reason as a higher authority. *Schroeckh*, in his Church History since the Reformation, (vol. v., p. 560. &c.), replies to *Ziegler;* and while he admits that *Socinus* professed to regard the Bible as the source of all religious truth, and no where expressly allows reason to have dominion over revelation; he yet maintains that *Socinus*, who was but a poor expositor, took great liberties with the scriptures, and in reality, *practised* upon the principle stated by *Mosheim*, though perhaps without much consciousness of it. And the subsequent Socinians, he says, proceeded farther and farther, till they at last discovered what was the fundamental principle of their theology: and since this discovery, they do not hesitate to avow it. Hence he concludes, that *Mosheim* is quite justifiable, in making such a statement as he here gives —*Tr.*]

cepts of the divine law which regulate the *words* and the *external actions*. Yet in stating and describing the duties of men, they were obliged to be uncommonly rigorous; because they maintained, that the object for which God sent *Jesus Christ* into the world, was, to promulgate a most perfect law. And hence, very many of them hold it unlawful, to resist injuries, to bear arms, to take oaths, to inflict capital punishments on malefactors, to oppose the tyranny of civil rulers, to acquire wealth by honest industry, and the like. And here also we unexpectedly meet with this singularity, that while on other subjects they boldly offer the greatest violence to the language of the sacred writers, in order to obtain support for their *doctrines;* they require, that whatever is found in the scriptures relating to the *life* and to *morals*, should be understood and construed in the most simple and literal manner.

§ 19. The *Racovian Catechism*, which is generally regarded as the only creed of the sect and as an accurate portrait of their religion, contains only the popular system of doctrine, not that which their leaders and doctors hold impressed on their minds.(40) A person therefore, who wishes to know the grounds and the sources from which the simple statements of the Catechism originated, must read and examine the works of their theologians. Besides, the Catechism omits many doctrines and regulations of the Socinians, which might contribute to increase the odium under which the sect labours, but which serve to lay open its internal character and state. It appears therefore, to have been written for foreigners, to mitigate their indignation against the sect, rather than for the use of Socinians themselves.(41) And hence, it never obtained among them the authority of a public rule of faith; but their doctors have always been at full liberty, either to alter it, or to exchange it for another. By what rules the church is to be governed, and in what manner public religious worship is to be celebrated, their doctors have not taught us with sufficient clearness and uniformity. But in most things, they appear disposed to follow the customs of the *Protestants*.(42)

(40) *Jo. Andr. Schmidt* has treated expressly, on the authors and the history of this celebrated book, in his essay, de Catechesi Racoviensi, published in 1707. Add, *Jo. Christ. Köcher's* Bibliotheca Theol. Symbol., p. 656. &c. The very learned and veracious *Geo. Lewis Œdr*, not long since published a new edition of it, with a solid confutation annexed; Frankf. and Lips., 1739, 8vo. [There are properly *two* Racovian Catechisms, a larger and a smaller. The writer of the smaller, was *Valentine Smalcius*, who drew it up in German, and first published it in 1605. It is entitled: Der kleine Catechismus zur Uebung der Kinder in dem Christlichen Gottesdienst in Rakow, 1605. The larger was likewise published in German, by the same *Smalcius*, in 1608; but *Hieron. Mascorovius* translated it into Latin in 1609, under the title: Catechesis ecclesiarum, quæ in regno Poloniæ, magno ducatu Lithuaniæ, et aliis ad istud regnum pertinentibus provinciis, affirmant neminem alium, præter patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, esse illum verum Deum Israelis, &c. Afterwards *John Crell* and *Jo. Schlichting* revised and amended it; and after their death, *Andr. Wissowatius*, and *Stegmann* the younger, published it in 1665. In 1680, it was subjoined to *Crell's* Ethica Aristotelica, as an Appendix, in order to procure it a wider circulation. All these editions were in 4to. In the year 1684, there was an edition in 8vo, still more complete, as it contained the notes of *Martin Ruarus*, *Benedict Wissowatius* the younger, and of one not named —*Schl.*]

(41) This may be inferred from the fact, that they presented a Latin copy of it to *James* I. king of Great Britain, but a German copy to the university of Wittemberg. [To show their gratitude, the theologians of Wittemberg allowed a feeble confutation of it to be drawn up by *Frederic Baldwin*, which was first published in 1619; and *James* I. condemned the book to the flames. —*Schl.*]

(42) This appears from *Peter Morscovius*

§ 20. Few are unapprized, that the first originators of the Socinian scheme possessed fine talents and much erudition. But when these were dead or removed, the *Unitarians* of Poland seem to have had but little thirst for knowledge and intellectual cultivation, and not to have required their teachers to be men of acumen and well instructed in literature and the arts. They however adopted other views, after they obtained liberty to open schools at Racow and Lublin, and when they had discovered, that their cause could not possibly be upheld without defenders and vindicators in no respect inferior to their opposers. Their love of learning began to be ardent, from about the time that *Faustus Socinus* undertook to sustain and to regulate their tottering and ill-arranged church; and not a few persons, eminent for their learning as well as their birth, were to be found among them. For they were disposed to have the study of eloquence pursued, the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin literature taught to the young, and philosophy expounded to select individuals. The Racovians, according to the custom of the age, made *Aristotle* their guide in philosophy; as appears from *John Crell's* Ethica, and from other monuments of those times.

§ 21. At the same time the leaders of the sect declare, in numberless places in their books, that both in the interpretation of the Scriptures and in explaining and in demonstrating the truths of religion in general, clearness and simplicity are alone to be consulted, and that no regard should be paid to the subtilties of philosophy and logic: which rule, if the interpreters and doctors in the highest esteem among them had considered as laid down for *themselves*, they would have given much less vexation to their opposers. For in most of their books, exquisite subtilty and art are found, combined with an indescribable amount of either real or fictitious simplicity. They are most acute, and seem to be all intellect, when discussing those subjects which other Christians consider as lying beyond man's power of comprehension, and therefore as simply to be believed. On the contrary, all their sagacity and powers of reason forsake them, just where the wisest of men have maintained, that free scope should be given to reason and human ingenuity. Although this may appear contradictory, yet it all flows from that one maxim of the whole school, that whatever surpasses the comprehension of the human mind, must be banished from Christian theology.

§ 22. The *Unitarians*, as soon as they were separated from the society of the Reformed in Poland, became divided into parties; as has been already mentioned. The subjects of dispute among them, were, the dignity of Jesus Christ; a Christian life and behaviour; whether infants are proper subjects of Christian baptism; whether the Holy Spirit is a *person*, or a divine *attribute*; and some other subjects. Among these parties, two continued longer than the others, and showed themselves less docile and manageable to the pacificators; namely, the *Budnæan* and *Favorian* sects. The former had for its founder and leader, *Simon Budnæus*; a man of acuteness,

or *Morskowsky's* Politia ecclesiastica, quam vulgo Agenda vocant, sive forma regiminis exterioris ecclesiarum Christianarum in Polonia, quæ unum Deum patrem, per filium ejus unigenitum in Spiritu sancto confitentur; in 3 Books, composed in 1642, and published by *Œder*, a few years since, at Nuremberg, 4to. This book is mentioned by *Christ. Sand.* Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar., p. 142; who says, it was written *for the use of the Belgic churches*.

who perceiving more clearly than others, whither the principles of *Lælius Socinus* would lead, maintained that *Jesus Christ* was not to be honoured with our prayers, nor with any other kind of worship; and in order more easily to support this error, he declared that Christ was conceived, not by virtue of any divine power, but in the way that all other men are. These tenets indeed, harmonize very well with the first principles of the Socinian scheme; but to the majority they appeared intolerable and execrable. *Budnæus*, therefore, who had many disciples in Lithuania and Russian Poland, was deposed from his ministerial office in 1584, and with his adherents, was excommunicated. But he is said to have afterwards given up his opinion, and to have been restored to the communion of the sect.(43)

§ 23. Into nearly the same error which had proved disastrous to *Budnæus*, a little while after, fell *Francis Davides*, a Hungarian, and superintendent of the Socinian churches in Transylvania; for he resolutely denied, that prayer or any other religious worship should be offered to *Jesus Christ*. After *Blandrata* and also *Faustus Socinus* himself, (who had been sent for into Transylvania for this very object in 1573), had in vain employed all the resources of their ingenuity in efforts to reclaim *Davides;* the prince of Transylvania, *Christopher Bathoræus*, threw him into prison; where he died at an advanced age, A.D. 1579.(44) Yet his sad fate did not end the controversy, which he had commenced. For *Davides* left behind him disciples and friends, who long contended strenuously for the tenets of their master, and who gave no little trouble to *Socinus*, and to his followers in Poland and Lithuania. Among them the following were most distinguished, *James Palæologus* of Chios, who was burned at Rome in 1585; *Christian Francken*, who held a dispute with *Socinus* himself; *John Sommer*, rector of the school at Clausenburg;(45) and some others. This sect was usually called, by the Socinian writers, the sect of *Semi-Judaizers*.(46)

(43) See *Christoph. Sand's* Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar., p. 54, 55. Epistola de vita Wissowatii; ibid., p. 226. *Ringeltaube* von den Pohlnischen Bibeln, p. 144, 152, &c. Moreover, *Samuel Crell*, the most learned Socinian of our age, (in the Thesaurus Epistolar. Crozianus, tome i., p. 111), is of opinion, (how justly, I cannot say), that *Adam Neuser* a German, was the author of this degrading opinion of Christ.

(44) *Sand*, loc. cit., p. 55, 56. *Faustus Socinus*, Opp. omnia, tom. i., p. 353, 395, tom. ii., p. 713, 771, where is given his Dispute with *Francis Davides*. *Stan. Lubieniecius*, Historia reformat. Polonicæ, lib. iii., cap. xi., p. 228.

(45) See, respecting these persons, *Sand's* Biblioth., p. 57, 58, 86. The dispute of *Socinus* with *Francken* on this subject, is in *Socinus'* Works, tom. ii., p. 767. [*Palæologus* was actually of the race of the Greek emperors, who bore this name. At Rome he fell into the hands of the Inquisition; but he escaped by flight. In Germany he held himself for a Protestant, and in Poland for a Socinian. They made him their rector at Clausenburg. But as he journeyed through Moravia, he was seized by order of the emperor *Maximilian*, and transmitted to Rome. —*Francken* was of Gardzlegen, and a native Lutheran. But he turned Catholic, and entered the order of Jesuits. Afterwards he revolted to the Unitarians; and was made rector first of Chmielnizk in Poland, and then of Clausenburg. As the Turkish war obliged him to go to Prague, he again turned Catholic. His writings are mentioned by *Sand*, loc. cit.—*Sommer* was a native of Pirna in Meissen, and went to Transylvania at the instigation of *Blandrata*.—*Schl.*]

(46) *Faustus Socinus* wrote a book, expressly, *contra Semi-Judaizantes;* which is in his Opp., tom. ii., p. 804. *Socinus* and his friends did not expend so much effort and care in the suppression of this faction, because they supposed it very pernicious and hostile to the Christian religion. On the contrary, *Socinus* himself concedes, that the point in debate was of no great consequence, when he declares, that it is not necessary to salvation that a person should pray to *Christ*. In his answer to *Wujeck*, (Opp., tom. ii., p.

§ 24. Towards the *Farnovians*, the Socinians were much more indulgent; for they were not excommunicated, nor required to abandon the opinions they held, but only to conceal them, and not advance them in their sermons.(47) The head of this party was *Stanislaus Farnovius* or *Farnesius;* who was induced by *Peter Gonesius*, to prefer the Arian hypothesis before the Socinian; and who maintained, that before the foundation of the world, *Christ* was either begotten or produced out of nothing, by the supreme God. What he thought of the Holy Spirit, is less clear: but it is known, that he forbid his followers to pray to the Holy Spirit.(48) When *Farnovius* separated himself from the other *Unitarians*, 1568, he had many adherents, who were distinguished both for influence and learning; among others, *Martin Czechovicius*, *John Niemoiovius*, *Stanislaus Wisnowius*, *John Falconius*, and *George Schomann*. But a part of these were overcome, by the gentle treatment and the dexterous reasoning of the Socinians; and others were afterwards discouraged and disheartened, by the discreet managements of *Faustus Socinus*. At last the party, being bereft of its leader *Farnovius*, who died in the year 1615, became dispersed and extinct.(49)

538, &c.), he says: *But if any one is possessed of so great faith, that he dare always go directly to God himself, and does not need the consolation which arises from the invocation of Christ his brother, tempted in all things; such a one is not obliged to pray to Christ.*(a) According to his judgment therefore, those have a higher degree of faith, who neglecting Christ pray only to God himself. Why then so severely avenge the crime of *Davides*, who wished to lead all Christians directly to the Father? *Lubieniecius* also, in his Historia reform. Polonicæ, lib. iii., cap. xi., p. 228, not obscurely detracts very much from the importance of this controversy, when he writes, that in Transylvania, (*there were billows raised in a teacup*), fluctus in simpulo excitatos esse. From which it appears manifest, that the Socinians made war upon *Davides* and his adherents, perhaps solely for this reason, lest by tolerating his opinion, they should inflame the enmity of other Christians against themselves, which they already felt to be sufficiently great; while they deemed the opinion, in itself considered, to be one that might be tolerated.

(a) Quod si quis tanta est fide præditus, ut ad Deum ipsum perpetuo recta accedere audeat, nec consolatione, quæ ex Christi fratris sui per omnia tentati invocatione, indigeat, hic non opus habet, ut Christum invocet.

(47) Epistola de vita Wissowatii, p. 226. According to the testimony of *Sand*, (Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar., p. 87). *Erasmus Johannis* was admitted to the office of teacher in the Socinian congregation at Clausenburg, on the condition, that in his sermons he should advance nothing to show that *Jesus Christ* existed before *Mary*.

(48) *Sand's* Biblioth., p. 52, and in various passages, under the names we have mentioned.

(49) We omit here the names of the more distinguished Socinian writers of this century, because a large part of them have been already noticed in the preceding history. The rest may be easily collected from *Sand's* Bibliotheca.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

OF THE

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

SECTION I.

THE GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The Romish Congregation for propagating the Faith.—§ 2. Urban VIII. The College for propagating the Faith.—§ 3. French Congregations of this kind.—§ 4. Hence many Missionaries; among whom, the Jesuits are distinguished.—§ 5 Yet the Jesuits became suspected.—§ 6 The Plans of the Jesuits cause Contention.—§ 7. Propagation of Christianity in India.—§ 8. The Kingdoms of Siam, Tonquin, &c.—§ 9. China.—10. Progress there.—§ 11. The Jesuits accused.—§ 12 The principal Accusation. History of it.—§ 13. Chinese Controversy. The first Question.—§ 14. The second Question.—§ 15. Christianity in Japan.—§ 16. Destroyed and overthrown.—§ 17. Protestant Missions in Asia.—§ 18. In Africa.—§ 19, 20 In America.—§ 21. The Enemies of Christianity in England.—§ 22. Hobbes, the Earl of Rochester, &c.—§ 23. Vanini, Rugger, Leszynski, Knutzen.—§ 24. Benedict de Spinoza.—§ 25. Literature and Science cultivated and improved.—§ 26. Mathematical Science especially.—§ 27. History.—§ 28. Languages and Eloquence studied.—§ 29. The Law of Nature.—§ 30. Aristotelian and Paracelsic Philosophy.—§ 31 Peter Gassendi.—§ 32. The Cartesian Philosophy.—§ 33 Its principal Adversary, Gassendi.—§ 34. Two Sects of Philosophers, the Mathematical and Metaphysical.—§ 35. Propagation and Improvement of the Metaphysical Philosophy.—§ 36. Progress of the Mathematical Philosophy.—§ 37. Philosophers, who were not of these Schools.

§ 1. The arduous efforts, commenced by the Roman pontiffs in the preceding century, for extending the Christian church, and thus exalting the glory and dominion of the Romish see, were in this century placed upon a permanent and solid basis; whereas, before, they had been tottering and ill supported. In the first place, *Gregory* XV. at the instigation of his chaplain *Narnius*, established at Rome in 1622, the famous *Congregation for propagating the faith* (Congregatio de propaganda fide,) and furnished it with very extensive revenues. This body, which consists of thirteen cardinals, two priests, and one monk, together with a scribe,(1) has for its object the support and the propagation of the Romish religion in all parts of the world. *Urban* VIII. and after him, numerous wealthy individuals enriched it with so great revenues, that it is able to make almost unlimited

(1) Such is the number of members in this body, as stated by *Gregory* XV. in his bull for its establishment: Bullarium Romanum, tom. iii., p 472, ed. Luxemb. Nor is a larger number mentioned by *Urban Cerri;* Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 259. But *Ja. Aymon,* in his Tableau de la cour de Rome, pt. iii., cap. iii., p. 279, makes it to consist of eighteen cardinals, one papal secretary, one *apostolical prothonotary*, one *referent* or *referendary*, and one of the *assessors* and scribes of [the *Inquisition* or] what is called the *Sacred Office.*

expenditures. Hence it sends out numerous missionaries to the most remote nations; publishes books of various kinds, necessary for learning foreign and some of them barbarous languages; causes instructions in Christianity, and other works designed to enkindle piety or confute error, to be drawn up in the languages and appropriate characters of the several nations; maintains and educates a vast number of selected youth, designed for missionaries; liberally educates and supports young men, who are annually sent to Rome from foreign countries, in order to become instructers of their countrymen on their return home; takes up and provides for persons, whose constancy in professing and defending the Romish religion has drawn on them banishment or other calamities; and plans and accomplishes various objects, almost beyond belief to those not acquainted with their affairs. Devoted to its use, the institution has a very splendid and extensive palace, the delightful situation of which gives it exquisite charms.(2)

§ 2. To this institution, *Urban* VIII. in the year 1627 added another, not indeed equally magnificent, yet renowned and very useful; namely the *College* or *Seminary for propagating the faith;* in which young men from almost all nations, were educated to become preachers of Christianity in foreign countries, and were instructed and imbued with the utmost care, in all the literature and learning necessary for so important an office. The commencement of this great institution was owing to the zeal of *John Baptist Viles*, a Spaniard residing at Rome; who for this object presented to the pontiff all his possessions and property, including his very elegant mansion. Many others afterwards imitated his liberality, and to this day, imitate it. *Urban* at first placed this college under the care and authority of three *canons* of the three *patriarchal* churches at Rome: but since the year 1641, it has been under the control of the *Congregation*, already mentioned as established by *Gregory* XV.(3)

§ 3. In 1663, the *Congregation of priests for foreign missions*, was instituted by the royal authority in France; and likewise the *Parisian Seminary for missions to foreign nations*, was founded by certain French bishops and theologians, in which men might be educated and instructed, in order

(2) The authors who treat of this Congregation, are enumerated by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, cap. xxxiii., p. 566. To whom may be added, *Dorotheus Ascianus*, de montibus pietatis ecclesiæ Romanæ, p. 522, &c., where there is a list of the books published by the Congregation, up to the year 1667. [The annual revenue of this Congregation, near the close of the seventeenth century, was about 24,000 Romish dollars. *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, vol. iii., p. 715.—*Tr.*]

(3) *Hippol. Helyot*, Histoire des Ordres Monastiques Religieux et Militaires, tome viii., cap. xii., p. 78, &c. *Urban Cerri*, Etât présent de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 293, &c., where however the first founder is erroneously called *Vives*. [It is not certain, that *Viles* rather than *Vives*, was the true name of the founder.—He established *ten* scholarships, for youth from foreign lands. Cardinal *Barberini*, the pope's brother, in 1637 and 1638, added *thirty-one* more scholarships; for Georgians, Persians, Nestorians, Jacobites, Melchites, Copts, Abyssinians and Indians; and in defect of these, for Armenians from Poland, Russia, and Constantinople. The scholars on *Barberini's* foundation, were to pledge themselves to become missionaries among their own countrymen, or to go wherever the Congregation de propaganda should order them.—*Urban Cerri* was secretary to the Congregation de propaganda, and drew up an account of the Present State of the Romish Church in all parts of the world, for the use of *Innocent* XI., which fell into the hands of the Protestants, and was translated and published, English and French, in the year 1716. *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. iii., p. 715, &c.—*Tr.*]

to become preachers of Christianity among the nations estranged from Christ. From this *Seminary* go forth, even to the present day, the *apostolic vicars* of Siam, Tonquin, and Cochin China, the bishops of Babylon and the apostolic vicars of Persia, and other missionaries to the Asiatic nations; and they derive their support from the ample revenues of the *Congregation* and the *Seminary*.(4) But the *Priests for foreign missions*(5) and their pupils, generally have much contention and controversy with the Jesuits and their missionaries. For they are displeased with the method pursued by the Jesuits for the conversion of the Chinese and others; and moreover, the Jesuits will not submit to the commands of the *apostolic vicars* and *bishops* appointed by the *Congregation*, as required by the pope and by the Romish *College for propagating the faith*. Likewise the French *Congregation of the holy sepulchre*, instituted by *Autherius* the [titular] bishop of Bethlehem, was required by *Urban* VIII., in the year 1644, to always have fit men in readiness to be sent to the nations ignorant of Christianity, whenever the pontiff or the *Congregation for propagating the faith*, should demand their services.(6) The other bodies of less note established in various countries for the purpose of enlarging the church, and the pains taken by the Jesuits and the other orders to provide a supply of missionaries, I shall leave to others to enumerate and describe.

§ 4. From these colleges and societies issued those swarms of missionaries, who travelled over the whole world so far as it is yet discovered, and from among the most ferocious nations gathered congregations that were, if not in reality, yet in name and in some of their usages, Christian. Among these missionaries, the *Jesuits*, the *Dominicans*, the *Franciscans*, and the *Capuchins*, obtained the greatest glory. Yet they mutually assail and accuse each other publicly, of disregarding and dishonouring the cause of Christ, and even of corrupting his holy doctrines. The *Jesuits* in particular are the most spoken against, both by the others who labour with them in the glorious cause of enlarging the Saviour's empire, and by the great body of their own church. For it is said, that they instil into most of their proselytes, not the pure religion which Christ taught, but a lax and corrupt system of faith and practice; that they not only tolerate or wink at practices and opinions that are superstitious and profane, but even encourage them among their followers; that they amass vast riches, by traffic, and by other unbecoming arts and occupations; that they are eager after worldly honours, and court the favour of the great by adulation and presents; that they involve themselves needlessly in civil affairs, and in the intrigues of courts; that they frequently excite seditions and civil wars in nations; and finally, that they will not obey the Roman pontiff and the vicars and bishops whom he sends out. If one calls for the witnesses to support these heavy charges, he finds himself overwhelmed with their multitude and their splendour. For there are brought forward, illustrious and very grave men from every Catholic country; and among them are many, on whom can fall no suspicion of envy, credulity, or ignorance; such as cardinals, members of the Congregation for propagating the faith, and—what cannot be surpassed—some of the pontiffs themselves. Nor do these

(4) See particularly, the Gallia Christiana Benedictinor., tom. vii., p. 1024, &c. *Helyot*, Histoire des Orders, tome viii., cap. xii., p. 84, &c.

(5) They are generally called, by the French: *Messieurs des Missions étrangères.*

(6) *Helyot*, loc. cit., cap. xiii., p. 87 100.

witnesses come forward unarmed for the contest; but they assail the doubting with the very facts perpetrated by the Jesuits, particularly in China, India, Abyssinia, and Japan, to the great injury of the Romish cause.(7)

§ 5. Though the Jesuits exerted all their sagacity and cunning, (for which they are said to be pre-eminent), in order to silence these accusations, yet they could not prevent their being heard and regarded at Rome. Among many circumstances which go to prove this, may be mentioned especially the following, that the board at Rome which controls absolutely all sacred missions, has now for many years employed the Jesuits more sparingly and more cautiously, than formerly; and that on great and trying occasions, it sets a higher value on the sobriety, poverty, and patience of even the *Capuchins* and *Carmelites*, than on the abundant resources, the ingenuity, and the courage of the Jesuits. Yet neither this board nor even the pontiffs, are able to correct all that they either tacitly or openly censure in the Jesuits; but they are obliged, however much against their wishes, to tolerate a great number of things. For the disciples of *St. Ignatius* have acquired in various ways so great influence, and so much wealth, throughout the Romish world, that they dare menace even the monarch of the church; nor can they without hazard, be compelled to obey his injunctions, whenever they are indisposed to submit. This most powerful society either itself dictates the decrees of the Romish court; or if dictated by others, it either with impunity refuses to obey them, or by its ingenuity gives them such an interpretation as the interests of the Ignatian fraternity demand. At least common fame so states, and appeals to the evidence of striking facts; while the Jesuits deny the charge.

§ 6. The cause of this great dissension between the Jesuits and the other Christian missionaries, is, that the Jesuits pursue a very different method in converting nations to Christianity, from that pursued by their colleagues and associates. The Jesuits are of opinion, that people deeply sunk in superstition should be approached with art and policy; and that they are to be led, by a cautious and careful hand, to embrace the Gospel. Hence, they explain and interpret the received doctrines and opinions of the pagans,—as for instance, the precepts of *Confucius* in China,—in such a manner, that they may seem to differ as little as possible from the doctrines of Christianity; and if they find any thing in their religion or their history, analogous at all to the faith and the history of Christians, they readily adduce it in proof of the harmony between the old religion and the new. The rites and usages also, which the nations received from their progenitors, unless they are totally opposite to the Christian rites, they tolerate; and either changing their form a little, or referring them to a better end than before, accommodate them to Christianity. The natural biases and propensities of the people, they treat with all the indulgence possible, and carefully avoid whatever is opposed to them. The priests and men of learning, by whom the populace are generally led, they labour in all possible ways, and even by pious frauds, to secure and bring over to their party. They court the favour and the friendship of those in power, by presents, by the cultivation of various arts, mathematics, medicine, painting, &c., and by affording them counsel and aid in their difficulties. I might specify many other particulars. Now all these, their colleagues

(7) A great amount of testimony is collected by the author of the Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus, Utrecht, 1741, 8vo, throughout the preface.

and associates look upon as artifices and tricks, unworthy of ambassadors of Christ; who, they think, should plead the cause of God openly and ingenuously, without deception and cunning. Hence they attack superstition, and every thing that grows out of it or tends towards it, openly and avowedly; do not spare the ancestors or the ancient ceremonies of the pagans; pay no attention to their chiefs, their courts, their priests; state the mysteries of Christianity nakedly, and do not hesitate to oppose the hereditary religions of the nations.

§ 7. The name and the religion of Christians, were sounded over nearly all Asia in this century, by these ministers of the Romish see. We begin with *India;* nearly all the parts of which, and especially those formerly subject to the Portuguese till they were driven out by the Dutch, received some sparks of the heavenly light, though involved in much obscurity, by the labours of the Jesuits, and also of some Theatins and Augustinians. But of all the missions that were undertaken to these nations, none has been more noticed and talked of, than that to *Madura:* and none is said to have produced more abundant fruits, quite to the present times. *Robert de Nobili*, or as some write it *De Nobilibus*, an Italian Jesuit, who commenced this mission, reflecting that the Indians abhor all Europeans, and on the other hand venerate exclusively the race of Brahmins, as if descended from the gods, and that they will listen to no other teachers; feigned himself a Brahmin, come from a distant country; and by staining his face, and adopting that very austere and painful mode of life which the *Sanianes* or penitents lead, he persuaded the credulous people to believe him. By this artifice, he first brought over twelve Brahmins to adopt his discipline: and their example induced a great multitude to follow him as their master. After the death of *Robert*, this singular establishment lay for some time neglected.(8) But afterwards, by the counsels and exertions of the Portuguese Jesuits, it was revived; and it is continued at the present time, by such Jesuits both French and Portuguese as think themselves able to submit to its very severe rules. These fictitious Brahmins, who deny themselves to be Europeans or *Franks*, (*Pranghis*, as the Indians pronounce it), and pretend to have been born in the northern regions, are said to be at the head of a community almost numberless, and one which is annually increasing by large accessions; nor is this very incredible.(9)

(8) *Urban Cerri*, Etât présent de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 173.

(9) The Jesuits can scarcely find words adequate, when they would either extol the glory and the effects of this mission, or describe the sufferings and labours voluntarily endured by the missionaries. See the Lettres curieuses et édifiantes écrites des missions étrangères, tome i., p. 9, 32, 46, 50, 55., [ed. 1819, tome vi., p. 24, &c.] Father *Martin*, there (p. 9) [p. 24] pronounces it *the most beautiful and most perfect mission that ever was;* la plus belle qui soit au monde. Each of the missionaries is said to have baptized at least a thousand persons annually; (p. 11) [p. 25]. Le moins que chaque Missionaire en baptise par an, est mille. Yet, if credit is to be given to him, (p. 12) [p. 26], access to the sacred font was not unadvisedly allowed of. Persons were long under trial, and were instructed for four months, in order to their being received: and those received, so live, that they appear more like heavenly angels, than like men; ils vivent comme des Anges. And very rarely do there occur among them, any instances of such sins as merit eternal death. If the causes of this extraordinary sanctity are demanded, the Jesuits mention two. The first is, the lives of the missionaries; than which nothing could be more austere and more revolting to human nature; (p. 15) [p. 27] la vie des Missionaires ne scauroit être plus austère ni plus affreuse selon la nature. See also tome xii., p. 206; tome xv., p. 211, &c. They neither allow themselves the use of bread, nor wine, nor flesh, nor fish, but live upon

But what is reported of the immense hardships and sufferings they endure for the sake of Christ, is, by many, thought to admit some doubt. For it is said, they practise deception, and torture themselves variously in public, but in private, regale themselves with wine, flesh, and other sensual pleasures.

§ 8. The Jesuits were the first who exhibited a knowledge of the truth, to the inhabitants of *Siam*, *Tonquin*, and *Cochin China*; *Alexander of Rhodes* being leader of the enterprise.(10) And vast numbers in those

water and pulse, of the most insipid kinds, and without condiments. Their dress and other things correspond with their diet. The other reason assigned, is, that these new Christians live entirely separated from Europeans; who are said, (p. 16, 17), by their licentiousness and corrupt morals, to contaminate all Christian converts from among the Indians. See also what is said in various places in these Lettres, concerning this mission to Madura; e. g., tome ii., p. 1, &c.; tome iii., p. 217; tome v., p. 2; tome vi., p. 119, &c.; tome ix., p. 126, and elsewhere.—*Madura* is a kingdom situated in the heart of the Peninsula of India this side the Ganges. An accurate geographical map of all the countries embraced in the mission to Madura, was published by the Jesuits, in the Lettres curieuses et édifiantes des Missions, tome xv., p. 60, &c., [tome vii., p. 321, ed. Lyons, 1819. There is also a map of all Hindostan, in tome viii., p. 239. —*Tr.*] The French Jesuits established a mission, after the model of this, in the Indian kingdom of the *Carnatic*, and its vicinity. See Lettres édifiantes, tome v., p. 3, 240. Near the end of the century, other Jesuits projected a similar mission in the territories of the king of *Maravia*, [or *Marawas*]. See Lettres édifiantes, tome ii., p. 1; tome x., p. 79. But the Jesuits themselves admit, (Lettres édif., tome vi., p. 3, 15, 66, 107, &c.), that their mission was more successful in the kingdom of *Maravia*, than in that of the Carnatic. Perhaps the French Jesuits, who founded the Carnatic mission, were unable so perfectly and patiently to follow that severe and painful mode of living, which this plan required, as the Portuguese and Spanish Jesuits were. Recently, *Benedict* XIV. who does not approve of this crafty method of the Jesuits in converting nations, by a mandate issued A.D. 1744, has prostrated all these once most celebrated missions. This pontiff would have no wiles and tricks employed in the important work of extending the limits of the church. See *Norbert's* Memoires Historiques pour les Missions Orientales, tome i. and iv. The entire history of these missions, together with a copy of *Benedict's* decree, is in *Thom. Mar. Mammachus*, Origines et Antiquit. Christianæ, tom. ii., p. 245, &c.—[*Robert de Nobili* was born of high parentage at Rome, in 1577; became a Jesuit, at the age of twenty; studied philosophy at Naples, and theology at Rome. In the year 1606, he obtained leave to go as a missionary to the Indies, and was made an assistant to the Jesuit, *Gonsalvo Fernandes*, who by ten years labour among the Indians had only been able to baptize a few natives who were at the point of death. *Robert* early perceiving, that the Indian ideas of *caste* formed a great obstacle to their conversion, and prevented all success among the higher castes; determined to convert this insurmountable obstacle into a successful engine. Having obtained the approbation of his plan by the archbishop of Cranganore, he assumed the habits and the garb of a Brahmin, shut himself up in a cell, avoided society, learned well the Tamul and the Sanscrit languages, and studied the sacred books of the Hindoos; and then came forth, avowing himself a foreign Brahmin, and a reformer of the corruptions of the Brahminic religion. All admired his eloquence and his learning. He first gained one Brahmin to his Christian Brahminism; and then others, till the number amounted to seventy. These suffered some opposition from the other Brahmins: but *Robert's* chief difficulty was from the opposition of the Catholics to his whole plan. The case was carried to Rome, and there warmly debated: and it was not without difficulty, that *Robert* was permitted to go on in his begun course. Yet he continued his labours nearly half a century, and then died at Meliapore, in 1656. After his death, his semi-Christian community declined for a time; but it was revived again by other Jesuits; and so enlarged, that in 1699 it was said to embrace more than 150,000 members. (Lettr. Edif., tom. vi., p. 25, ed. 1819.) After the whole plan was condemned however, by *Benedict* XIV. in 1744, the community rapidly declined; and soon became extinct. See *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, vol. iii., p. 707, &c., and vol. vii., p. 36, &c.—*Tr.*]

(10) See the various writings and especially the Journal of *Alexander de Rhodes* a man not lacking in genius and discernment published at Paris, 1666 and 1682, 4to. [See Relazione de' felici successi della S.

nations, are said to have eagerly embraced it. Influenced by this good news, *Alexander* VII. in the year 1658, thought it advisable to place some bishops over this new church; and therefore ordered certain French priests of the *Congregation of priests for foreign Missions*, to repair thither clothed with authority from him. But the Jesuits, who can bear no superiors, and scarcely any equals, treated those pious and good men with very great contumely and abuse, and would not suffer them to enter into their harvest.(11) Hence arose in the court of Rome, a protracted contest; the issue of which plainly showed, that the Jesuits would easily resort to the authority of the pontiffs to extend and confirm their power, but treated it with contempt, when it opposed their interests and emoluments. Subsequently the French king *Lewis* XIV. sent a splendid embassy in the year 1684, to the king of Siam, whose prime minister at that time was a Greek Christian named *Constantius*, a crafty and ambitious man, soliciting that monarch to pay homage to our Saviour. The embassy was accompanied by many priests and Jesuits, among whom were several well skilled in the arts and sciences for which the king had some taste. These induced a portion of the people to abandon the superstition of their fathers; but all their efforts to convert the king and chiefs, were in vain. And all hopes of adding the Siamese to the Christian church, soon became extinct, together with the king and his favourite *Constantius*, who had invited the French into the country and wished by their means to establish his own power. For in a sedition raised in 1688, some of the princes put them both to death:(12) whereupon the French were obliged to return home.

Fede predicata da' PP. della Compagnia di Giesu nel Regno del Tunchino; Rome, 1640, 4to. His Catechismus Latino-Tunchinensis, is one of the most rare books; as also his Grammat. ling. Annamiticæ, the vernacular language of Tonquin. *Alexander* went to that country in 1627; and in the space of three years, converted more than 5000 persons; among whom he formed some to be so good converts, that in the year 1634, it was estimated, there were more than 30,000 Christians in Tonquin. From Macao, he entered upon a mission in Cochin-China; but, after he had converted numbers, he was imprisoned, and banished the country. The mission, however, was afterwards prosecuted by other fathers. See Relation de tout ce, qui se passa à la Cochinchine, Paris, 1652, 8vo. *Christof. Borro*, Relazione della nuova Missione de PP. della Compagnia di Giesu nel regno de Cocincina; Rome, 1631, 8vo, and, Delle Missioni de' Padri della Compagnia di Giesu nel regno del Tunchina; Rome, 1663, 4to.—*Schl.*]

(11) There were various pamphlets published at Paris, in 1666, 1674, and 1681, in 4to, in which these French missionaries, whom the Jesuits refused to admit as fellow-labourers in enlightening idolaters, eloquently described their sufferings and their wrongs. The most accurate and full, is the account given by *Francis Pallu*, whom the pope had made bishop of Heliopolis; printed in French, Paris, 1688, 8vo. The subject is also expressly taken up in the Gallia Christiana of the Benedictines, tom. vii., p. 1027. A concise history of the affair, is given by *Urban Cerri*, Etât présent de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 199, &c., who, though he was secretary of the *Congregation de propaganda fide*, inveighs with great severity against the frauds, the cruelty, and the lust of domination of the Jesuits; and laments, that his *Congregation* had not the power requisite to restrain that arrogant sect. At the close of his narrative, he remarks that he was not at liberty to state all the crimes committed by the Jesuits in this controversy; because the pontiff ordered them kept out of sight. Vôtre Sainteté à ordonné, qu'elles demeurassent sous le secret. See also, *Hipp. Helyot's* Histoire des Ordres Monastiques, tome viii., cap. xii., p. 84, &c.

(12) An account of this mission and its proceedings, has been given by *Tachard*, *Chaumont*, *La Loubere*, and others. Among these, the preference is due to *Loubere*, who was a man of learning and genius. [His work is entitled: Du Royaume de Siam, par Mr. de la Loubere, Envoyé extraordinaire du Roy auprès du Roy de Siam, en 1687 et 1688, 2 vols. 8vo, Amsterdam, 1691. It is

§ 9. China, the largest and most opulent of all the Asiatic kingdoms, was visited by great numbers of Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans, Capuchins, and others, at the commencement of this century, for the purpose of spreading the knowledge of Christianity. All these, though disagreeing in other things, unite in proclaiming the astonishing success of their labours. But the Jesuits justly claim the chief honour of surmounting the obstacles, that opposed the progress of Christianity among that discerning and proud nation so tenacious of the customs of their ancestors. For discovering, that the Chinese who are naturally perspicacious and eager after knowledge, were very fond of the arts and sciences, and especially of the mathematics, the Jesuits sent among them men who were not only well acquainted with human nature and discreet in managing affairs, but likewise profoundly versed in learning and the abstruse sciences. Some of these, by their address, the elegance of their manners, and their skill in business, soon acquired such influence, that high honours and offices were conferred on them by the emperor; and they were employed in affairs of the greatest consequence in the court itself. And supported by such patrons, other teachers of humbler rank and talents were able, without much difficulty,

chiefly occupied with the geography of the country, and the transactions of the embassy. Father *Tachard's* book is entitled: Voyages de Siam des Peres Jesuites envoyés par le Roy, avec leurs observations. Paris, 1686, 4to, and Amsterdam, 1699, 12mo. Second Voyage au Royaume de Siam. Paris, 1689, 4to, and Amsterd., 1699, 12mo. How far such Jesuitical accounts deserve credit, the world already knows. Here belongs also: Relation de l'Ambassade de Mr. de Chaumont à la Cour du Roy de Siam, avec ce qui s'est passé du plus remarquable durant son Voyage, Paris, 1686, 12mo, which was followed by: Journal, ou Suite du Voyage de Siam, par Mr. l'Abbé de Choisy, (who accompanied Mr. *Chaumont*), Amsterdam, 1687, 12mo. The unhappy change which afterwards took place in Siam, to the disadvantage of the French, is described by *Farges*, a French officer who was an eyewitness, in his Relation des Revolutions arrivées à Siam dans l'année 1678, Amsterdam, 1691, 12mo: and by Father *d'Orleans*, in his Histoire de Mr Constance, primier Ministre du Roy de Siam, et de la derniere Revolution, Paris, 1692, 12mo.— *Schl.* The politic *Constantius*, who had himself been in France, hoped to derive some advantages from a French alliance; and the Jesuit missionaries united with him in representing the king as much inclined to embrace Christianity. But when *Chaumont*, the French ambassador arrived, (if we may believe the Jesuit *Tachard*), the king of Siam told the ambassador, "that it was no light matter, to change a nation's religion, after it had prevailed for more than 2200 years: and that he wondered the king of France should interest himself so much, in a matter that did not concern *him*, but God only; and one too, which God himself seemed to leave very much to the free choice of men. Could not God, (said he), who gave to all men similar bodies and similar souls, have given them also similar views of religion, if he had seen fit? And as he has not done so, it is presumable, that he takes pleasure in being worshipped in so many different ways." He, however, allowed Christianity to be preached in his realm. The French court, not less solicitous probably to secure the trade of the country, than to change its religion, sent a second embassy in 1688, under *de la Loubere*; which was accompanied by a large military force. The French were now in possession of the port of Mequi and the castle of Bancop, which were keys to the country; and *Constantius* himself began to be alarmed. But the same year, the nobles conspired against this minister and slew him; and in the tumult, the king himself lost his life. This revolution changed the whole face of things; and the French were obliged to quit the country. Yet probably some priests remained behind; for the very next year, it is said, some thousands of Siamese were baptized. At least, it is certain Christianity was not exterminated: for near the close of the century, *Urban Cerri* states, that an apostolical vicar was residing in the capitol, had a church there, and a seminary in which he educated natives for the priesthood; and that some of the great men of the court were professed Christians. See *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, vol. vii., p. 54, &c., who refers to the authors above mentioned.—*Tr.*]

to collect disciples of every rank, sex and age, in all the provinces of this vast empire.

§ 10. This prosperity was checked in some measure, when *Xun-Chi*, the first emperor of the Mongol race, died, and left his son a minor. For the chief nobles, to whose care and instruction the heir of the empire was committed, having long viewed Christianity with strong aversion, abused their power to prostrate both it and its friends, and especially the Jesuits, whom they stripped of all their advantages, their fortunes, and their privileges, and persecuted with great cruelty. The first man among the Jesuits, *John Adam Schall*, venerable not only for the high office he sustained in the court, but also for his age and his extensive learning, was cast into prison, and condemned to be put to death: while the others were banished the country. This was in the year 1664. But in the year 1669, when *Cham-Hi* took the sceptre into his own hands, the prostrate cause of Christianity was not only restored, but in process of time so advanced and exalted, that the Jesuits commonly reckon this the commencement of the golden age of the Christians in China. For the emperor, who possessed very great talents and genius, and was eager in the pursuit of knowledge and improvements,(13) first recalled the Jesuits to court, and restored them to their former rank; and then sent for others of the same family from Europe, especially such as were skilful in the different arts and sciences. Some of these he placed in the highest offices of the state, and employed in civil transactions of the greatest importance. And some of them, particularly Frenchmen, he received to personal intimacy, and made them his own teachers in various things, especially in philosophy and the mathematics. It was not difficult for the Jesuits when thus exalted, to obtain many friends and supporters of Christianity, and to provide protection for its preachers. And hence, from nearly all the countries of Europe and Asia, many labourers entered into this harvest; and an immense number of people, with but little difficulty, were brought to profess Christianity. The religion of Christ seemed quite triumphant in China, when in the year 1692, this emperor who was so extremely partial to the Jesuits, published that famous law, in which he denied that the Christian religion was injurious to the state, as its opposers had contended, and gave all his subjects full liberty to embrace it: nay more, he erected a splendid temple for the Jesuits in 1700, within the limits of his own palace.(14)

(13) See *Joach. Bouvet's* Icon regia Monarchæ Sinarum; which *Godfr. Will. Leibnitz* translated into Latin, and published in the second part of his Novissima Sinica, 1699, 8vo. Add *Jo. Bapt. du Halde's* Description de la Chine; and the *Lettres* of the Jesuits respecting their missions; in which they here and there extol the virtues of this emperor, whom all admit to have been a great man.

(14) A concise, but neat account of all these events, is given by *Jo. Bapt. du Halde*, Description de la Chine, tom. iii., p. 128, &c., and by the Jesuit *Fontaney*, Lettres édifiantes et curieuses, tom. viii., p. 176, &c., [ed. Lyons, 1819, tome ix., p. 434, &c. —*Tr.*] A more full account is in various books; of which, the most easy to be procured is, *Joseph Suarez* de libertate religionem Christianam apud Sinas propagandi narratio; published by *Leibnitz*, 1698, in the first part of his Novissima Sinica. Most of the others are enumerated by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, cap. xxxix., p. 663, &c. See also my Ecclesiastical History of China, written in German, and published both in a separate work, and as a Preface to the German translation of *Du Halde's* work ["This History was translated into English, and published in the year 1750, with the title: Authentic Memoirs of the Christian church in China."—*Macl.*]

§ 11. That the Jesuits actually did and accomplished all that is above stated, is not denied even by their worst enemies: but whether their mode of proceeding was regular and right, or such as the nature and dignity of the Christian religion demanded, was long contested, and still is so, with great acrimony. The enemies of the Jesuits, (and they are both numerous and very bitter, especially among the Dominicans and the Jansenists), strenuously maintain, that they purchased this success at the expense of committing offences and crimes of a detestable character. In the first place, they are charged with putting a very faulty construction upon the old religion of the Chinese, and persuading the emperor and his nobles, that there was very little if any difference between the ancient and original religion of China, or the precepts of *Confucius* the great philosopher and lawgiver of that nation, and the religion of *Christ:* and to this execrable misrepresentation, it is said, they added others of less moment; in particular they led the Chinese, (who overrate every thing ancient, and undervalue what is new), to believe that many ages ago, the Chinese had been made acquainted with *Christ* and had paid him worship: and that to these false representations must be attributed the favourable disposition of the emperor towards Christianity, and the transition of the leading men to the side of the Jesuits. In the next place, they are charged with being utterly regardless of the duties and the virtues which become the ministers of Christ. For they not only accepted, but eagerly sought after honours and civil offices: and elated by the munificence of the emperor, their whole life was contaminated by the magnificence of their dress, the luxury of their tables, the multitude of their servants, and the splendour of their palaces; and that they devoted themselves not so much to spreading the knowledge of Christianity, as to teaching human science, especially the mathematics; and that they even took charge of military affairs, and commanded in the field of battle. And lastly, Jesuits of inferior rank, are represented as engaging with eagerness in usurious speculations, in merchandise, and in other arts, by which wealth and worldly distinction are acquired, to the immense disgrace of their profession. Some of these charges, the Jesuits admit indeed, but at the same time labour to extenuate: but the first and the last, they contend, are sheer fabrications of their enemies. And doubtless, those who have opportunity to examine the matter thoroughly, will be willing to admit, that envy and ill will have had some share in this controversy.

§ 12. The principal charge against the Jesuits in China, is, that they confound light and darkness; or that the more easily to overcome the scruples of the Chinese, they mix the superstitions of China with Christianity, and allow their disciples to follow the profane customs and the impious rites of their ancestors. The Jesuit *Matthew Ricci*, the father of the Chinese church, supposed that the greatest part of the rites which were enjoined by the Chinese laws, might suitably be observed by the converts to Christianity; for they originated, he said, not from religious considerations but from state policy, or were civil and not religious ceremonies; nor were they viewed in any other light, except perhaps by some of the lower class of people.(15) A contrary opinion was embraced, not only by the Dominicans and Franciscans who were associated with the Jesuits in

(15) See *Mammachius*, Origines et Antiquit. Christianæ, tom. ii., p. 373, &c.

the mission, but also by very learned men among the Jesuits themselves both in China and Japan; one of whom, *Nicholas Lombard*, stated the grounds of his dissent in writing.(16) This controversy having been long agitated in private, was brought to Rome by the Dominicans in the year 1645; and since that period, it has greatly disturbed the whole Romish church. *Innocent* X. in the year just named, decided in favour of the Dominicans, and condemned the indulgence allowed by the Jesuits to the Chinese. But *Alexander* VII. in the year 1656, at the instigation of the Jesuits, nullified this decision in effect, though not in express terms; and declared, that certain rites to which the Chinese were attached, might be observed by Christians. The Dominicans renewed their complaints in the years 1661 and 1674, under the pontificate of *Clement* X., but they seem to have been foiled by the power of the Jesuits. In the year 1684, this fatal controversy was renewed in China, where it had been at rest for several years, and was prosecuted with greater warmth than before. Victory seemed inclining to the side of the Dominicans, when *Charles Maigrot*, a doctor of the Sorbonne, whom the pontiff had constituted his vicar in the province of Fohi, and who was afterwards bishop of Conon, by a public decree in the year 1693, decided that the opinions and regulations of the Jesuits were contrary to the purity of the Christian religion. But the pontiff, to whose authority [and sanction] *Maigrot* had subjected his decree, would not decide either way on any part of it, until the whole cause should have a legal investigation. Accordingly in the year 1699 he appointed a board of special judges, or a *Congregation* as the Romish court terms it, to give this angry contest a thorough examination. As soon as this resolution of the pontiff was made known, all the enemies of the Jesuits in the Romish church and particularly in France, took the field; and in various pamphlets, they assailed the character and the proceedings of the Jesuits in the most vehement manner. Nor were the Jesuits wanting in effort on their part.(17) The termination of this conflict, belongs to the history of the next century.

§ 13. This controversy, which has called forth the talents of so many men of the finest genius, if we separate from it some minor questions, and such as relate rather to the Jesuits themselves than to the subject in debate, may be all embraced under two heads. (I.) The Chinese call the supreme god whom they worship, TIEN, and SHANG-TI; that is, in their language, *Heaven*. And the Jesuits transferred this name to the God of Christians: whence it seemed to follow, that they thought there was no difference between the chief God of the Chinese and the infinitely perfect God of the Christians; or, that the Chinese had the same ideas of their TIEN or *heaven* as the Christians have of God. But this the adversaries of the Jesuits deny.

(16) See *Christ. Kortholt's* Preface to the second volume of Leibnitz's Epistles, § vi., p. 18, &c., who has subjoined to this volume, the tracts of *Nich. Lombard* and *Antony de St. Maria* against the Jesuits, with the remarks of *Leibnitz*. There is also, in this work, (p. 413), a long dissertation of *Leibnitz* addressed to *Remond*, on the philosophy of the Chinese; in which he pleads the cause of the Jesuits.

(17) *Du Halde*, Description de la Chine, tome, iii., p. 142, &c. The other writers, who are quite numerous, are mentioned by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, cap. xxxix., p. 665, &c. Add *Voltaire*, Siecle du Louis XIV., tome ii., p. 318, &c. But especially worth reading, is the ingenious patron of the Jesuits, and himself a Jesuit, *Gabriel Daniel*, Histoire Apologetique de la conduite des Jesuites de la Chine; printed in the third volume of his Miscellaneous Tracts, p. 1, &c.

The first question therefore is, whether the Chinese understand by the words specified, the visible material heavens, or the Lord of heaven, that eternal and all perfect *Being* whose throne is in the heavens, and who from that throne in infinite wisdom rules all human affairs; that is, such a God as Christianity presents to us for our worship. The Jesuits maintain the latter; for they contend, that these names were used by the ancient Chinese philosophers, (who they think, had just ideas of natural religion), to denote very clearly such a God as the Christians worship: and therefore, they would not prohibit their converts from continuing to use those terms in their prayers and discourses, to designate the supreme Being; nay, they used them constantly themselves to denote the true God. But their adversaries maintain the contrary opinion; and contend, that the ancient philosophy of the Chinese was full of impiety, and made no distinction between God the divine Spirit, and nature or the material world. They assert moreover, that *Confucius* himself, whom the Chinese hold in the highest veneration, was a stranger to religion and piety, and one who supposed that all existing things arose necessarily into being in the course of nature. This disagreement gave rise to very learned discussions concerning the customs, laws, and opinions of the ancient Chinese; which discussions have indeed made us acquainted with many things that were previously not well understood, but they have not decided the point for which they were undertaken. It seems that entire assent is not to be given either to the positions of the Jesuits, or to those of their adversaries; and that the TIEN of the ancient Chinese, was indeed far inferior in his attributes to the God of Christians, and yet was something different from the visible heavens or the air.

§ 14. The ancient laws of China require the people, annually, at stated seasons, to honour their deceased ancestors, with certain ceremonies which seem to be of a religious nature; and moreover all the literati of the nation, at certain times, must pay a kind of worship which also seems to have a religious aspect, to the philosopher *Confucius*, (who is accounted the father of all wisdom), in the buildings consecrated to him. Hence a second question is, whether those honours, which the Chinese are required to pay to the souls of their deceased ancestors, and all the literati to *Confucius* the oracle of the nation, are civil honours or religious; whether they are *sacrifices*, or only regulations established for state purposes. The Jesuits say, the ancient Chinese lawgivers instituted these rights to keep the people in order, and to preserve the tranquillity of the state; that the Chinese do not offer religious worship to the souls of their ancestors, nor to *Confucius*, but only testify by certain ceremonies, their grateful sense of the merits and the benefits both of their ancestors and *Confucius*, and engage to copy after their example. And hence they conclude, that it is allowable for Christians to observe these sacred rites of their country, provided they understand the true nature and grounds of them, and always keep in sight the object of their institution. And whoever wishes to see the cause of Christianity flourish and advance in China, can scarcely think differently from the Jesuits, whether their statements are erroneous or correct. For it has been established by public law for many ages, that no one shall be accounted a good citizen in that country, or be admitted to any office in the state, who does not perform the ceremonies in question. But the Dominicans and the other opposers of the Jesuits, contend that these rites are no small part of the Chinese religion; that *Confucius* and

the souls of their ancestors, are objects of religious worship to the Chinese; and of course, that such as observe these rites, offer an affront to the divine Majesty, and cannot be accounted Christians. The more candid among the Jesuits themselves, do not deny that this is a very difficult question to decide; and hence some of them, at last resorted to the plea of necessity; and urged that minor evils, if productive of the greatest advantages, are scarcely to be accounted evils.(18)

§ 15. At the commencement of this century, Japan was filled with an astonishing multitude of people, whom the Jesuits especially had convinced of the excellence of the Christian religion. But this very brilliant success was somewhat disturbed, partly by the hatred of Christianity entertained by the national priests and by certain nobles of the court, which gave rise to severe persecutions in one place and another both of the newly converted Christians and their teachers; and partly by the internal broils and contentions, among those who had the charge of this rising church. For here, as in other countries, the Augustinian, Dominican and Franciscan missionaries, waged a most pernicious war against the Jesuits. For both at the court of Rome and elsewhere, they taxed them with insatiable avarice, with too great indulgence both to the vices and the superstitions of the Japanese, with a crafty management unbecoming the ministers of Christ, with an eagerness to reign and give law, and with other crimes of no less mag-

(18) ["The public honours paid to *Confucius* twice a year, used to be performed before his statue, erected in the great hall or temple, that is dedicated to his memory. At present they are performed before a kind of *Tablet*, placed in the most conspicuous part of the edifice, with the following inscription: *The throne of the soul of the most holy and the most excellent chief teacher, Confucius.* The literati, or learned, celebrate this famous festival in the following manner. The chief mandarin of the place exercises the office of priest, and the others discharge the functions of deacons, sub-deacons, and so on. A certain sacrifice, called *Ci*, which consists of wine, blood, fruits, &c., is offered, after the worshippers have prepared themselves for this ceremony by fasting and other acts of abstinence and mortification. They kneel before the inscription, prostrate the body nine times before it, until the head touches the ground, repeat a great variety of prayers; after which, the priest, taking in one hand a cupful of wine, and, in the other, a like cup filled with blood, makes a solemn libation to the deceased, and dismisses the assembly with a blessing. The rites performed by families, in honour of their deceased parents, are pretty much of the same nature

"Now in order to know, with certainty, whether this festival and these rites be of a *civil* or a *religious* nature, we have only to inquire, whether they be the same with those ceremonies that are performed by the Chinese, in the worship they pay to certain celestial and terrestrial *spirits* or *genii*, which worship is undoubtedly of a religious kind. The learned *Leibnitz* (Præf. Novissim. Sinicorum) undertook to affirm, that the services, now mentioned, were not of the same kind, and, consequently, that the Jesuits were accused unjustly But that great man does not appear to have examined this matter with his usual sagacity and attention. For it is evident, from a multitude of relations every way worthy of credit, and, particularly, from the observations made on the Chinese missions, by that learned and candid Franciscan *Antonio de S. Maria*, (Epp Leibnitz., vol. ii.), not only that *Confucius* was worshipped among the *idols*, and the *celestial and terrestrial spirits* of the Chinese, but that the oblations and ceremonies, observed in honour of him, were perfectly the same with those that were performed as acts of worship to these *idols* and *spirits*. Those that desire a more ample account of this matter, may consult the following authors: *Budæi* Annal. Histor. Philos., p. 287, where he treats De superstitioso Demortuorum apud Sinenses cultu.—*Wolfii* Not. ad Casaubon., p. 342.—*Nic. Charmos*, Annot. ad Maigrotti Historiam cultus Sinensis. But more especially *Arnaud*, Morale Pratique des Jesuites, tome iii., vi., vii., and a collection of historical relations published at Cologne, in 8vo, in the year 1700, under the following title: Historia cultus Sinensium, seu Varia Scripta de cultibus Sinarum inter Vicarios Apostolicos, et P. P. S. I. controversis."—*Macl.*]

nitude. The Jesuits on the other hand complained, that their accusers by their imprudence, their ignorance of human nature, their pertinacity, the asperity of their manners, their rustic mode of life, and other faults, injured rather than promoted the progress of the Christian cause among that high-minded and discerning people. Yet all these causes were by no means adequate to arrest the progress of Christianity, or to bring very great evils upon the immense multitude which had made profession of this religion. And perhaps means might have been devised at Rome, if not for entirely removing, yet for quieting and tempering these contentions.(19)

§ 16. But in the year 1615, the emperor of Japan himself commenced a most direful persecution against the Christians, which exceeds any thing to be found in the whole history of the Christian church; and this persecution continued many years, and did not cease until it had exterminated Christianity from that empire. For the Christian religion was judged to be altogether intolerable; because it was deemed ruinous to the safety of the nation, and to the majesty of their supreme pontiff, whom the populace of Japan believed to be the offspring of the gods themselves, and likewise, to the most sacred institutions and religion of their ancestors. The foreign Christians therefore, the Portuguese especially and the Spaniards, were required to depart the kingdom; and the Japanese who had renounced their idols, were required to abandon Christ, or undergo the most cruel death. This dreadful persecution destroyed an innumerable multitude of people, of every class, age, sex, and rank, who preferred to die amid the most exquisite tortures, rather than violate their vows of fidelity to Christ. And if either the Jesuits or their adversaries, were guilty of faults while pleading the cause of Christ; they now as it were atoned for them, by their own blood. For most of them gave themselves up to death for Christ, with the greatest firmness, and some of them with joy and triumph.—The causes of this horrid persecution, are differently stated by different parties. The Jesuits throw some of the blame on the imprudent conduct of the Dominicans and Franciscans; and these in return, ascribe it to the avaricious, factious, arrogant temper of the Jesuits.(20) And both unitedly accuse the

(19) Besides the writers mentioned by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, cap. xl., p. 678, &c., see *Domin. Charlevoix*, Histoire du Japon, tom. ii., lib. xi., &c., p. 57, &c.

(20) *Engelbert Kæmpfer* has given a neat account of this protracted business, in the sixth of those Dissertations, which he has annexed to his History of Japan, § 4, &c., p. 64–75, of the English edition. But it will also be but fair to hear the fuller statement of *Domin. Charlevoix*, who has omitted nothing that would go to excuse the Jesuits; in his Histoire generale de Japon, tom. ii., livr. xii., p. 136, &c. The other writers are mentioned by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, cap. xl., p. 678. Add the Acta Sanctorum, tom. i., mensis Februarii, p. 723, &c., where may be seen the History of the church founded in Japan, and the life and death of those who were first slain by the Japanese, on account of Christianity. *Mammachius*, Origines et Antiquit. Christianæ, tom. ii., p. 376, &c.—[*Francis Xavier* first preached the gospel in Japan, in 1549. After he left that country in 1552, great numbers were converted; and some Japanese became Jesuits. Schools and churches were erected, even in the capitol Meaco. In 1585, a Japanese embassy was sent to Rome. Christianity at that time seemed about to become the prevailing religion; there were at least 200,000 Christians; and among them princes, courtiers, chief nobles, and generals; the Bonzes and their religion were openly ridiculed; and the emperor had excluded paganism altogether from a new city which he founded; and he was on terms of intimacy with the Jesuits. But the base conduct of the Europeans, led the emperor to suspect Christianity to be all a farce; and he became jealous of the designs of these strangers. He was also offended at the refusal of some converted females to surrender to him their chastity: and at the instigation of his favourite, in 1587,

Dutch and English of studiously inflaming the emperor of Japan with hatred against the Portuguese and Spaniards, as well as against the Roman pontiffs, so that they alone might have control among the Japanese, and might secure their commerce to themselves. The Dutch and English reply, that neither the Spaniards nor any other adherents to the Roman pontiff, were by them accused; but only that the perfidy of the Spaniards was detected. And indeed, nearly all agree in this, that the emperor was persuaded by certain letters intercepted by the Dutch, and by other evidence bearing a strong probability, that the Jesuits and the other teachers of the new religion designed to raise a sedition by means of their disciples, and to bring Japan under the power of the Spanish king; and hence the tyrant, equally cruel and jealous, thought he could not be safe and quiet, unless he destroyed every vestige of Christianity. From that time, Japan has been closed against all foreigners; and even the shadows of the Christian name are exterminated with fire and sword. A few of the Hollanders, who are

he commenced a persecution. All Jesuits were ordered to quit the country. Some obeyed; but others remained, under the protection of the nobles. Out of about 250 churches, 70 were pulled down. In 1590, more than 20,000 Christians lost their lives. But the next year added 12,000 new converts. In 1596, a Spanish sea-captain driven upon the coast, showed a chart of extensive countries subject to his master; and being asked how his master could conquer so many nations, he said, their missionaries went forward, and prepared the minds of the people to favour him, and then fleets and armies made an easy conquest. This statement was transmitted to court, and produced great jealousy of the missionaries. The emperor swore, the Spaniards should never thus conquer Japan; and he immediately set himself to exterminate Christianity, which he called a devilish law. The missionaries were imprisoned; and not a few of them as well as their converts, were put to death. The persecution continued several years. Yet in 1603, there were 120 Jesuits, most of them priests, in Japan. After this, an English officer of a Dutch ship, cautioned the Japanese to beware of the military enterprises of the Spaniards; and represented the priests as designing men, who had been excluded from most European countries, and who did not teach genuine Christianity. This produced a fresh persecution: and in the province of Nangasaki, where there had been more than 40,000 Christians, not one could be found in 1622; all had either renounced their religion, or been put to death. Hitherto however, the number of Christians in Japan had not diminished greatly; and some estimates make them to have been about 400,000, and others near 600,000. But now things began to take a different turn. In 1616, *Ijejas*, guardian to the young prince *Fidejori*, (who was favourable to Christianity, as were many of the nobles), slew his ward, and proclaimed himself emperor. The Jesuits were objects of his jealousy; and various causes induced him to forbid the farther spread of Christianity, and the ingress of monks and priests into the country. He likewise determined to bring back the Japanese Christians to the old religion. Edicts were issued for these purposes; but they were not at once rigorously executed. At length some Franciscan monks, sent as envoys from the Spanish governor of Manilla, imprudently ventured to preach openly in the streets of Meaco, and to erect a church there. This exasperated the government, and brought on a persecution, which is without a parallel in the annals of the church. Among the causes of it, were the intercepted letters mentioned in the text, giving account of a projected insurrection of the Christians, as soon as a Spanish force should appear on the coast. As soon as these letters reached the court in 1637, decrees were passed, requiring all foreigners to quit the country at once, on pain of death; and subjecting every foreigner to the same penalty, who should ever after set his foot in the country. The return of the Japanese Christians to paganism, was now peremptorily required, on pain of death. These decrees were rigorously executed: and two years after, the Portuguese were all driven from the country; and only the Hollanders were allowed to introduce a small quantity of European goods, and to live as it were imprisoned, in a corner of the empire. Thus fell the Japanese church, after it had stood very nearly a century. See *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. iii., p. 668 &c. —*Tr.*]

allowed annually to import a small quantity of European merchandise, live in an extreme corner of the kingdom, as it were enclosed in a prison.

§ 17. Many respectable and pious men endeavoured to rouse the Lutherans, in imitation of the Catholics, to efforts for imparting Christian truth to the nations enveloped in the darkness of degrading superstition. No one was more zealous in this cause, than the Austrian nobleman *Justinian Ernest*, baron of Wels; who proposed the formation of a society for this purpose, which should bear the name of *Jesus*.(21) But there were various causes, and especially the situation of the Lutheran princes, few of whom possessed any territories or fortified posts out of Europe, which prevented this matter from ever proceeding beyond good wishes and consultations. But the Reformed, and especially the English and the Dutch, whose mercantile adventures carried them to the remotest parts of the world, and who planted extensive colonies during this century in Asia, Africa, and America; enjoyed the best advantages for extending the limits of the Christian church. Nor did these nations wholly neglect this duty; although they are taxed, with grasping at the wealth of the Indians, but neglecting their souls, and perhaps they did not perform so much as they might have done. Among the English, by an act of parliament in the year 1647, the business of propagating Christianity was committed to the care of a society, composed of men of the highest respectability and integrity. This society was revived in the reign of *Charles* II., A.D. 1661; and again confirmed, and invested with extraordinary privileges and rights, by *William* III. in the year 1701; and being enriched with the splendid donations of kings, nobles, and private individuals, has continued down to our own times.(22) From this noble institution, great advantages have been deri-

(21) *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. ii., book xvii., ch. xv., § 23, &c., p. 1066, and pt. iii., ch. xv., § 18, p. 150. *Jo. Möller*, Cimbria Litterata, tom. iii., p. 75. [In 1664, this Hungarian baron published two letters addressed to the Lutheran community, on a reformation of manners and on efforts for the conversion of the heathen. In the first, he proposed these three questions: Is it right, that we Evangelical Christians should keep the Gospel to ourselves, and not seek to spread it abroad? —Is it right, that we every where encourage so many to study theology, yet give them no opportunity to go abroad, but rather keep them, three, six, or more years, waiting for parishes to become vacant, or for the posts of schoolmasters?—Is it right, that we should expend so much in dress, high living, useless amusements, and expensive fashions; yet hitherto have never thought of any means for spreading the Gospel?—His proposal to form a missionary association, was approved by some, but objected to by others, especially among the higher clergy. He himself advanced 12,000 dollars for the object; went to Holland, on the subject; and at length shipped for the Dutch West Indies, to engage himself in missionary labour: but he was no more heard of. Some feeble attempts were made to get up a missionary association, afterwards; but to no purpose, during this century. See the authors above cited.—*Tr.*]

(22) *Kennet*, Relation de la Societé etablie pour la propagation de l'Evangile par le Roy Guillaume III., Rotterd., 1708, 12mo. [In 1649 an ordinance was passed by the English parliament, for the erection of a corporation, by the name of *the President and Society for the propagation of the Gospel in New-England:* and a general collection for its endowment, was ordered to be made in all the counties, cities, towns, and parishes, of England and Wales. Notwithstanding very considerable opposition to the measure, funds were raised in this manner, which enabled the society to purchase lands, worth from five to six hundred pounds a year. On the restoration of *Charles* II., the corporation became dead in law; and Colonel *Bedingfield*, a Roman Catholic, who had sold to it an estate of 322 pounds per annum, seized upon that estate, and refused to refund the money he had received for it. But in 1661, a new charter was granted by the king; and the honourable *Robert Boyle* brought a suit in chancery against *Bedingfield*, and recovered the land. *Boyle* was appointed the first governor of the company,

ved, and are still daily derived, by many nations ignorant of Christ and especially by those in America. By the labours of the Dutch, an immense number of people in the island of Ceylon, on the coast of Malabar, in the island of Formosa, and in other countries of Asia, (which the Dutch either conquered from the Portuguese, or otherwise brought under their power), are said to have renounced the impious rites of their fathers.(23) If perhaps some extravagance may be found in these narrations, yet it is most certain, that this nation after it had obtained a firm establishment in the East Indies, adopted at great expense, various measures well calculated to imbue the natives with a knowledge of Christian principles.(24)

§ 18. As the interior parts of Africa proper have not yet been accessible to the Europeans, they still remain wholly destitute of the light of

and held the office about thirty years. (See *Wm. Brown's* History of the propagation of Christianity, vol. i., p. 62, &c., ed. N. York, 1821, and *Neal's* Hist. of the Puritans, ed. of *Toulmin*, Boston, 1817, vol. iv., p. 433, &c., but especially the Connecticut Evang. Magazine, vol. iv., p. 1, &c.) It was this society which supported the various missionary operations in New-England during the seventeenth century. Their expenditures in the year 1661, amounted to 738*l.* 8*s.* 1*d.* or $3280 87.—*Tr.*]

(23) See the letters addressed to John Leusden, de Successu Evangelii apud Indos Orientales ; published at Utrecht, 1699, 8vo.

(24) See *Jo. Braun's* La veritable religion des Hollandois, p. 71, 267, &c., Amsterd., 1675, 12mo. This work is an answer to the malignant tract of *Stoup*, entitled La religion des Hollandois ; in which he would insinuate, that the Dutch have no regard for religion whatever.—[The Dutch conquered Ceylon from the Portuguese, about the middle of this century ; and immediately established there the Protestant religion, excluding all others from every office. The Portuguese inhabitants, and the natives both Catholics and pagans, in large numbers, embraced the established faith, at least in pretence. The country was divided into 240 parishes ; a church was erected and a school established in each. Every ten schools had a catechist, who was their superintendent. About 15 clergymen were assigned to the island. In 1672, *Baldæus*, one of the Dutch ministers, gives account of 30 native churches in the province of Jaffnapatnam ; in which were about 30,000 attendants on worship upon Sundays, and about 16,000 pupils in the schools during the week. Near the close of the century, *Dr. Leusden* wrote to *Dr. Increase Mather* of Boston, "that in and near the island of Ceylon, the Dutch pastors had baptized about 300,000" of the natives. (*Mather's* Magnalia, book iii., vol. i., p. 510, ed. Hartford, 1820.) The Dutch had also translated and published in the Cingalese language, considerable portions of the Bible ; besides catechisms, prayers, and other Christian books.—The Dutch having possessed themselves of a large part of the island of Java, opened a church in Batavia the capitol, in the year 1621. Pursuing much the same plans here as at Ceylon, in the year 1721 they could reckon 100,000 Christians in Java ; and two Dutch, two Portuguese, and one or two Malay churches, at Batavia. The New Testament in Malay, was printed at Amsterdam, 1668, at the expense of the Dutch East India Company.—Soon after establishing the Gospel in Java, the Dutch sent ministers from Batavia to the island of Amboyna ; and in 1686, it is said, they had converted 30,000 of the natives. Here too, schools were established, and a number of ministers stationed, at the expense of the Dutch East India Company.—In 1634, the Dutch formed a settlement on the western part of the island Formosa. *Robert Junius* of Delft, was sent out by the Dutch government to establish Christianity there. He is said to have baptized 6000 persons ; and to have set up schools, in which about 600 young men were taught to read. He composed some prayers, and translated certain Psalms into the Formosan language : and though his labours were chiefly in the northern parts of the island, yet he had planted churches in twenty-three towns in the south, and had set pastors over them, when he returned to Holland. In 1661, the Gospels of Matthew and John were translated into the Formosan language, by *Dan. Gravius*, and printed at Amsterdam, together with a Catechism. But probably, before these books reached the island, it was captured by a Chinese pirate ; and it has since belonged to the Chinese.—Besides the converts in these places, the Dutch made many others in Sumatra. Timor, Celebes, Banda, Ternate, and the neighbouring Molucca Islands. See *Brown's* Hist. of the propagation of Christianity, vol. i., ch. iii., p. 15–28.—*Tr.*]

Christian truth. But in the maritime parts, especially those where the Portuguese have obtained settlements, the power of the barbarous superstitions has here and there been prostrated, and the Romish rites have succeeded in their place. Yet the ingenuous even of the Romish communion, do not deny, that the number of those in this part of the world who deserve the appellation of genuine Christians, is but small; that the greater part so worship Christ, as at the same time to follow the abominable superstitions of their fathers; and that even the best of them have many defects. What little advances Christianity has made in that country, are to be ascribed almost wholly to the efforts of the Capuchins, who in this century encountered incredible toils and hardships in bringing some of the ferocious nations of Africa to a knowledge of Christ. They persuaded, among others the kings of Owerra and Benin, to admit the truth of Christianity; and induced the very cruel and heroic queen of Matamba, *Anna Zingha*, in 1652, to allow herself and people to be baptized.(25) For the Roman pontiffs, or rather the society at Rome which superintends the propagation of Christianity, have judged that African missions for various reasons, were attended with peculiar dangers and difficulties, and could not well be performed by any but those early accustomed to austere modes of living and to the endurance of hardships. Nor did the other Romish monks appear to envy the Capuchins very much, their hard-earned glory.

§ 19. The India of the West, or what is commonly called America, is inhabited by innumerable colonists professing the Romish religion, Spanish, Portuguese, and French.(26) But these colonists, especially the Spanish and Portuguese, as appears from the testimony of very respectable men belonging themselves to the Catholic church, are, even the priests not excepted, the lowest and most abandoned of all that bear the Christian name, and far surpass even the pagans, in ridiculous rites and flagitious conduct.(27) Those of the aboriginal Americans, who have been reduced to servitude by the Europeans, or who reside in the vicinity of Europeans, have received some slight knowledge of the Romish religion from the Jesuits, Franciscans, and others; but the little knowledge they have received, is wholly obscured by the barbarity of their customs and manners. Those Catholic priests of various orders and classes, who in modern times have visited the wandering tribes of the forests remote from the settle-

(25) For illustration of these facts, besides *Urban Cerri*, Etât présent d l'Eglise Romaine, p. 222, &c., see *Jo. Anton. Cavazzi*, Relation Historique de l'Afrique [d'Ethiopie] Occidentale; which *Jo. Bapt. Labat* published in French, tome iii., p. 432, &c., tome iv., p. 28, 354, &c., and nearly the whole work, which is chiefly occupied with the history of the missions performed by the Capuchins in Africa during the last century. [*Dr. Maclaine* finds all these references totally wrong. *Schlegel* says: *Dr. Mosheim* meant Father *Fortunatus Alamandini's* Italian historical description of the kingdoms of Congo, Matamba, and Angola; Bologna, 1687, fol., whose statements the Italian Capuchin and missionary, *Jo. Anton. Cavazzi de Montecavallo*, has copied. And these last, *Labat* actually translated, in a free manner, into French, and published in five volumes 12mo, Paris, 1732, under the title: Relation historique de l'Æthiopie Occidentale. And this last is the work which *Mosheim* had in his eye; and not that of the same *Labat*, which was also published in five volumes 12mo, in 1728, entitled, Nouvelle relation de l'Afrique Occidentale.—*Tr.*]

(26) See the authors mentioned by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Lux Evangelii teti orbi exoriens, cap. xlviii., xlix., p. 769, &c. The state of the Romish religion in that part of America occupied by Christians, is briefly exhibited by *Urban Cerri*, Etât présent de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 245.

(27) See in particular, *Frezier*, Voyage du mer du Sud, p. 167, 218, 328, 353, 402, 417, 432, 533.

ments of Europeans, have learned by experience, that the Indians, unless they become civilized, and cease to roam, are absolutely incapable of receiving and retaining on their minds the principles of Christianity.(28) And hence, in some provinces both of South and North America, Indian commonwealths have been founded by the Jesuits with great efforts, and guarded with laws similar to those of the Europeans; and the access of all Europeans to them has nearly been cut off, to prevent their being corrupted by European vices; while the Jesuits sustain the rank both of teachers and of magistrates among them. But while the Jesuits highly extol the merits and zeal of their order in this thing, others deny their claims; and maintain, that they are more eager after public honours, wealth, and power, than the advancement of Christianity; and say, they have collected immense quantities of gold from Paraguay which is subject to their sole authority, and from other countries, which they have transmitted to their society in Europe.(29)

(28) An immense number of facts on this subject, are found in the *Letters*, which the French Jesuits wrote to their European friends, respecting the success of their missions, and which have been published at Paris.

(29) *Jo. Bapt. Labat*, when asked by *Tamburini*, the general of the order of the Jesuits, what progress Christianity was making among the Americans, boldly and frankly said: Either none or very little; that he had not met with one adult among those tribes, who was truly a Christian; that the preachers among them were useful, only by baptizing occasionally, infants that were at the point of death. Voyage du P. Labat en Espagne et en Italie, tome viii., p. 7. Je lui repondu qu'on n'y avoit fait jusqu' à present d'autres progrès que de baptizer quelques enfans moribons, sans avoir pû convertir veritablement aucun adulte. He added, that to make the Americans Christians, they must first be made *men:* Qu'il en falloit faire des hommes, avantque d'en faire des Chrêtians. This resolute Dominican, who had been a missionary in the American islands, wished to give the father of the Jesuits some salutary counsels respecting the immense possessions and wealth of his sons in the American islands: but the cautious old man dexterously avoided the subject: Je voulus le mettre sur les biens que la Compagnie possede aux Isles: il eluda delicatement cet Article. With no less spirit, the same *Labat* checked the supreme pontiff himself, *Clement* XI., who commended the activity of the Spaniards and Portuguese in furthering the salvation of the Americans, but taxed the French with negligence in this very important matter: the Spaniards and the Portuguese, said *Labat*, have no cause to boast of the success of their labours; they only induce the Indians to *feign* themselves Christians, through fear of tortures and death. Les Missionaires Espagnols et Portugais n'avoient pas sujet de se vanter des prétendues conversions des Indiens, puisqu'il étoit constant qu'ils n'avoient fait que des *hypocrites*, que la crainte de la mort ou des tourmens avoit forcez à recevoir de baptême, et qui étoient dimeurez après l'avoir reçû, aussi *idolatres* qu'auparavant., loc. cit., p. 12. To this testimony, so very recent and of so high authority, so many more ancient might be added, that it would be difficult to recount them. See also, respecting the American Jesuits, the Memoire touchant l'Etablissement considerable des Peres Jesuites dans les Indes d'Espagne; which is added to *Frezier's* Relation du Voyage de la Mer du Sud, p. 577, &c. *Franc. Coreal*, Voyages aux Indes occidentales, tom. ii., p. 67, 43, &c. See also, *Mammachius*, Origines et Antiquit. Christianæ, tom. ii., p. 337, &c. Respecting the Jesuits occupying the province of Paraquaria or Paraguay, see *Ulloa*, Voyage d'Amerique, tome i., p. 540, &c., and *Ludov. Anton. Muratori's* tract published in 1743, in which he pleads their cause against their accusers. [A full and very favourable history of the Jesuit republic of Paraguay, to A.D. 1747, with numerous documents and vouchers, may be found in the Jesuit *Fran. Xavier de Charlevoix'* Histoire du Paraguay, Paris, 1757, 6 tomes 12mo; also in English, but without the documents, London, 1769, 2 vols. 8vo.—In 1752, the king of Spain having ceded a considerable part of this Jesuit republic to the king of Portugal in exchange for other territories, the Indians, who dreaded the dominion of the Portuguese, absolutely refused to be transferred, and resisted the commissioners of the two governments by force of arms. This revolt of the natives was ascribed to the influence of the Jesuits, their immediate

§ 20. In the American provinces which the British occupied in this century, the cause of Christianity was urged with more wisdom, and of course with more success, upon the stupidity and amazing listlessness of the Indians. The glory of commencing this most important work, is justly claimed by those *Independents* as they are called, who had to forsake their country on account of their dissent from the religion established by law. Some families of this sect, that they might transmit uncontaminated to their children the religious principles they embraced, removed in the year 1620 from Holland to New-England, and there laid the foundation of a new commonwealth.(30) As these first adventurers were not unsuccessful, they were followed in 1629, by very many of those called *Puritans* in England; who were impatient of the evils they suffered from the persecution of the bishops, and of the court which favoured those bishops.(31) But these emigrants, at first, had to encounter so many hardships and difficulties in the dreary and uncultivated wilderness, that they could pay but little attention to the instruction of the Indians. More courage and more leisure for such enterprises, were enjoyed by the new Puritan exiles from England, who went to America in 1623 [1633], and subsequently, *Thomas Mayhew*, *Thomas Shepherd*, *John Eliot*, and many others. All these merited high praise, by their efforts for the salvation of the Americans; but none more than *Eliot*, who by translating the holy scriptures and other religious books into the Indian language, and by collecting and suitably instructing no small number of Christian converts among the barbarians, obtained after his death the honourable title of the *Apostle of the Indians*.(32)

rulers; and the enemies of that order seized this occasion, to effect not only the subversion of this their republic, but likewise the overthrow of the order itself. The Portuguese government was the first to suppress the order; and to justify their proceeding, they caused a narrative to be published, which was printed at the Hague, in French, in 1758, 8vo, with the title: La Republique des Jesuites au Paraguay renversée; in which the character of the order is treated with no indulgence. From that time onward, the order of Jesuits and their republic of Paraguay, have been generally treated with execration. But of late many discerning writers, especially among the Protestants, defend the cause of the Jesuits, and speak very favourably of their missionary labours in Paraguay.—*Tr.*]

(30) *Dan. Neal's* Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii., p. 128. *Ant. Wilh. Böhm's* Englische Reformationshistorie, book vi., ch. v., p. 807, &c. [*Cotton Mather's* Eccles. Hist. of New-England, b. i., ch. ii., &c. *Prince's* New-England Chronology; *Holmes'* American Annals, vol. i., and the other histories of the first planting of Colonies in New-England.—*Tr.*]

(31) *Increase Mather's* History of New-England, p. 126, &c. *Dan. Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. ii., p. 208, &c. [*Cotton Mather's* Eccles. History of New-England, book i., ch. iv., &c., and the other writers mentioned in the preceding note.—*Tr.*]

(32) *Jo. Hornbeck*, de conversione Indor. et gentil., lib. ii., cap. xv., p. 260. *Increase Mather's* Epistola de successu Evangelii apud Indos Occidentales ad Joh. Leusdenium, Utrecht, 1699, 8vo, [published also in English, in *Cotton Mather's* Eccl. Hist. of New-Eng., book iii., p. 508, &c., ed. Hartf., 1820; and in the Connecticut Evangelical Magazine, vol. iv., for 1803, p. 164, &c.—The Rev. *John Eliot* was born in England A.D. 1604. After leaving the university, he taught school a few years, and then removed to New-England in 1631, in order to preach the gospel without molestation. The church in Boston would have settled him as a colleague with *Mr. Wilson*; but he had promised several friends in England, that if they removed to America, he would become their pastor. Accordingly, on their arrival and settlement in Dorchester, he was ordained over them, in November, 1632; and served them 58 years, or till his death in 1690. He early turned his attention to the Indians around him; learned their language in 1644; and two years after, commenced a regular weekly lecture to them at Natic. It was in this year, that the general court of Massachusetts passed an act or order, to encourage the propagation of the gospel among the Indians. *Eliot* was countenanced and aided

These happy beginnings induced the Parliament and people of England, after a few years, to resolve on extending the enterprise by public measures and public contributions. Hence originated that noble society, which

by the ministers around him; who frequently supplied his pulpit in his absence, and were always ready to afford him counsel, and also to aid him occasionally, so far as their ignorance of the Indian tongue would permit, in imparting religious instruction to the Indians. He not only preached regular weekly lectures at Natic, but likewise occasionally to the Indian congregations at Concord, Dorchester mills, Watertown, and some other places. In the year 1670, he visited *twelve* towns or villages of Christian Indians under his care, in Massachusetts and along the Merrimac; in all of which there were Indian preachers regularly stationed, to serve them on Sundays and be their constant spiritual guides. At Natic there were *two* such teachers, and between *forty* and *fifty* communicants. For these natives, he translated into the Indian language, primers, catechisms, the Practice of piety, *Baxter's* Call to the unconverted, several of *Mr. Shepherd's* works, and at length the whole Bible, which was first published at Cambridge in 1664, and again just after his death. He set up schools in his Indian villages, introduced a regular form of civil government, and to some extent industry and the useful arts; and was the fountain from which the Indian preachers under him drew all their knowledge. See *Cotton Mather's* life of Eliot, in his Eccl. Hist of N. Eng., book iii., vol. i., p. 474–532. Connecticut Evang. Magazine, vol. iii., p. 361, 441; vol. iv., p. 1, 81, 161. *Brown's* Hist. of the propag. of Christianity, vol. i., p. 29, &c.—The *Rev. Thomas Shepherd* is erroneously placed among those in New-England who diffused Christianity among the Indians. He was a silenced English Puritan, born in 1606, educated at Cambridge, came to New-England in 1635, and was settled at Cambridge near Boston, where he preached till his death in 1649. He was a distinguished preacher, and writer on practical religion. See *Mather's* Eccl. Hist. of N. Eng., vol. i., p. 343, &c., and *Brook's* Lives of the Puritans, vol. iii., p. 103, &c.—In the year 1641, *Thos. Mayhew* senior obtained a grant of Nantucket, Martha's Vineyard, and the Elizabeth islands, which belonged to none of the existing colonies; and the year following he commenced a settlement at Edgarton on Martha's Vineyard. His son, *Thomas Mayhew* junior, was constituted pastor of the English settlement at Edgarton; while the father was chief magistrate, or governor as he was styled, of all these islands, until his death in 1681. The son, having learned the Indian language, commenced preaching to the Indians in his vicinity in 1646, on weekdays; and *Hiacoomes*, a converted Indian, under *Mr. Mayhew's* guidance, instructed his countrymen on the Lord's day. In 1652, an Indian school was opened; and by the end of the year, there were 282 converts to Christianity, who met at two places, the one three miles and the other eight from *Mr. Mayhew's* house. They were then formed into a regular church, and the work of conversion went on rapidly. In 1658 or 1659, *Mr. Mayhew* found the harvest so great and the labourers so few, that he determined to go to England and solicit aid. The vessel in which he sailed, was never heard from, after she left the port. *Thomas Mayhew* senior, after the death of his son, took on himself the labours of an evangelist, in addition to those of chief magistrate. In 1670, two Indian preachers, *Hiacoomes* and *John Tackanash*, were ordained to the office of regular pastors and teachers of the Indian church, while governor *Mayhew* continued the evangelist or overseer of all the Indians. In 1674, of the 360 Indian families on Martha's Vineyard, two thirds, or about 1500 persons, were professed believers in Christianity; and 50 persons were in full communion. There were then *ten* Indian preachers, and *six* different meetings on Sundays. At Nantucket, where the families were about 300, there were about *thirty* Indian communicants, and 300 professed believers in Christianity; *three* places of worship, and *four* Indian teachers. On the death of *Thomas Mayhew* senior, in 1681, his grandson, *John Mayhew*, son of *Thomas Mayhew* junr., having been some time minister to the English at Tisbury, in the middle of the island; took charge of the Indian congregations, till his death in 1689. His son, *Experience Mayhew*, when arrived at the age of 21, succeeded him in the year 1694; and laboured among the Indians successfully, for sixty years, or till about 1754. He was master of the Indian language, and translated into it various works for the use of his charge. He also composed a volume containing the lives of a large number of pious Indians, preachers and others. See the Connecticut Evang. Mag., vol. ii., p. 281, 361, 441, vol. iii., p. 5, 161, 249, and *Brown's* Hist. of the propag. of Christianity, vol. i., p. 47, &c.—In the colony of Plymouth, *Mr. Richard Bourne* preached to the Indians in and about Sandwich, in their own language. About the year 1660, he procured for them a per

derives its name from its object *the propagation of the Gospel;* and which, in its progress having increased in numbers, dignity, privileges, and advantages of every kind, has gradually enlarged and extended its efforts for the salvation of the nations estranged from Christ especially in America. Immensely more, as all must admit, remains still to be done: yet any one must be uncandid or ignorant of such things, who can deny that much has been done, and with greater success than was to be anticipated. We shall hereafter have occasion to speak of *Pennsylvania*, in which people of all sects and religions now live intermingled, and worship God in the manner they see fit. The Hollanders began to diffuse the knowledge of Christianity with great success, in those provinces of Portuguese America, which they had conquered under the conduct of *Maurice* prince of Orange:(33) but all these prospects were intercepted, by the Portuguese recovering their lost possessions after the year 1644. Nor did the Dutch, so far as I know, expend much labour and effort in improving the minds of the Indians that inhabited Surinam and the adjacent regions.

manent grant of the lands at Mashpee; formed an Indian settlement there, and a church, over which he was ordained by *J. Eliot* and others, in 1666. In 1674, his Indian charge embraced about 500 souls, of whom 90 were baptized, and *twenty-seven* communicants. He laboured among them about 40 years. *Brown*, loc. cit., p. 59.—*Mr. John Cotton*, minister of Plymouth, understanding the Indian language, preached to the natives south of Plymouth, in *five* different places, on week-days; and aided their Indian teachers to preach to them regularly. In the year 1693, he had about 500 Indians under his care.—About the same time, *Mr. Samuel Treat* of Eastham, preached in *four* Indian villages near Cape Cod, to about 500 Indians; who had native teachers for their regular preachers on the Lord's day.—At Sandwich also, *Mr. Thomas Tupper* preached regularly to about 180 Indians.—In Connecticut, something was done in this century, for the religious instruction of the Indians. The Rev. *Mr. Fitch* of Norwich was particularly desired to teach *Uncas*, a sachem, and his family, Christianity. *Mr. Stone* and *Mr. Newton* were employed, at the desire of the colony, to teach the Indians in Hartford, Windsor, Farmington and that vicinity. The Rev. *Mr. Pearson* of Killingsworth, who had learned their language, seems to have preached some to them. And the ministers of the several towns, where Indians lived, instructed them as they had opportunity. But no Indian church was ever formed in this colony. *Trumbull's* Hist. of Connect., vol. i., ch. xix., p. 494, &c.—The state of Christianity among the Indians of New-England, in 1687, was thus described by *Increase Mather*, in his letter to *Leusden:* "There are *six* churches of baptized Indians in New-England, and *eighteen* assemblies of catechumens professing the name of Christ. Of the Indians, there are *four*-and-*twenty*, who are preachers of the word of God: and besides these, there are *four* English ministers, who preach the Gospel in the Indian tongue."—*Tr.*]

(33) *Jo. Henr. Hottinger*'s Topographia Ecclesiastica, p. 47. *Fran. Mich. Janisson's* Etât présent des provinces unies, tome i., p. 396, &c. He also treats of Surinam, and the state of religion there, in cap. xiv., p. 407. [According to the testimony of *John Nieuhoff*, who resided in Brazil from 1640 to 1649, there were in 1643, or the year before the revolt of the Portuguese, five Protestant churches along the coast south of the Recife or Pernambuco; namely, at San Antonio, at Cap San Agostinho, at Serinhem, at Porto Calvo, and at Rio San Francisco. But these churches were not always supplied with ministers; as they came out only for limited periods. North of the Recife, there was in 1643, one Dutch minister at the island Tamaraca and Fort Orange, another at Rio Grande, and two at Parayba. At Recife or Pernambuco and in its vicinity, there were about 400 Protestants, Dutch, French, and English; and three Dutch ministers, besides one who served on board the fleet and on inland expeditions; and likewise one French and one English minister. In 1646, there were but seven Dutch ministers in Brazil. The churches were regulated according to the synod of Dort. The minister and the churchwardens constituted the church session. The deacons visited the sick, to provide for them. The children were catechized on Sundays; and the sacrament was administered four times a year. See *Nieuhoff's* voyages, in *Churchil's* Collection, Lond., 1730, vol. ii., p. 32.—*Tr.*]

§ 21. The opposers of all religion and especially of Christianity, are represented by some as more numerous in this century, and by others as less so, according to the party and the views which they embraced. The English complain, that from the times of *Charles* II. their nation was contaminated with the grossest of vices and profligacy, that this state of things gave rise to unbridled licentiousness of speculation and disputation on religious subjects; and that both united, produced a multitude of persons who prostituted their talents and ingenuity to extinguish all sense of religion and piety. And that these complaints were not groundless, appears from the numerous examples of Englishmen of this period, who either declared war against all religion, or who maintained that the religion of nature and reason was alone to be followed; and likewise from the many excellent treatises, by which the most solid writers of the nation defended the divinity and excellence of Christianity against their hostile assaults. The strongest evidence however, is the noble institution of the very learned knight, *Robert Boyle;* who by his will in 1691, bequeathed a splendid portion of his estate to religion; the income of which was to be annually paid over to acute and eloquent men, who should oppose the progress of impiety, and demonstrate and confirm the truth of natural and revealed religion, in eight public discourses each year.(34) Down to our own times, men of the greatest talents and genius have undertaken this service; and their discussions or discourses have been laid before the public, to the great advantage of all Europe.(35)

§ 22. By the English generally, *Thomas Hobbes* of Malmesbury, is represented as the leader and standard-bearer of the impious company, who from the accession of *Charles* II. set themselves in opposition to God and to things sacred. He was a man daring, crafty, acute and perspicacious, but of more genius than erudition or knowledge either sacred or human.(36)

(34) See *Ricotier's* Preface to his French translation of *Sam. Clark's* Discourses on the Being and Attributes of God, p. xiv., &c. Of *Boyle* himself and his merits, *Edw. Budgell* has treated very fully, in his Memoires of the Lives and Characters of the illustrious Family of the Boyles, London, 1737, 8vo. See the Bibliotheque Britannique, tome xii., pt. i., p. 144, &c. ["But above all, the late learned *Dr. Birch's* Life of Boyle, published in 8vo, in the year 1744; and that very valuable collection of Lives, the Biographia Britannica, Article *Boyle*, Robert, note (z). See also Article *Hobbes*, in the same collection."—*Macl.*]

(35) A catalogue of these discourses is given in the Bibliotheque Angloise, tome xv., part ii., p. 416, &c. A learned and neatly digested summary of all the discourses of this nature, thus far delivered, was published not long since in English, by *Gilbert Burnet;* which the French and the Germans have begun to translate into their languages. ["This abridgment comprehends the discourses of *Bentley, Kidder, Williams, Gastrell, Harris, Bradford, Blackhall, Stanhope, Clarke, Hancock, Whiston, Turner, Butler, Woodward, Derham, Ibbot, Leng, J. Clarke, Gurdon, Burnet, Berriman.*"—*Macl.*]

(36) See *Peter Bayle's* Dictionnaire, tome ii., p. 478. *Anth. Wood's* Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. ii., p. 461, of the late edition. [Add *Brucker's* Historia crit. philos., Appendix, Lipsic, 1767, 4to, p. 880, &c., where his life and character are described with impartiality and accuracy. In *Cromwell's* time he was a zealous adherent to the royalist party, and a defender of their rights with servile submission. Yet he lost the favour of the court, and died in 1679, in his 91st year, a private country gentleman. Two of his works, namely, de Cive, Paris, 1642, 4to, and his Leviathan, 1651, fol., are most worthy of notice. In them he recommends monarchic despotism, represents the human soul as material and mortal, discards all natural distinction between moral actions, and makes morality depend wholly on the enactments of monarchs.—*Schl.* The whole of the moral and political works of *Tho. Hobbes*, with a life of the author prefixed, were elegantly printed, probably under the eye of *Warburton*, Lond., 1750, fol.

He has however found some advocates, out of Great Britain; who maintain that he erred indeed, yet not so basely, as to subvert the being of a God and the worship of him.(37) Those who shall read attentively the books he has left, must admit, that if he was not himself destitute of all regard for God and religion, it is manifest his principles naturally lead to an utter disregard for all things sacred: and his writings betray, not obscurely, a mind most unfriendly to Christ and to the Christian religion. It is said however, that in his old age he became more rational, and publicly condemned the sentiments he had formerly published:(38) but whether he was sincere in this, is uncertain. With more truth it may be said of *John Wilmot*, earl of Rochester, who attacked God and religion with even more fury than *Hobbes*, that he became a penitent. He was a man of great discernment and brilliancy of genius, but of astonishing levity, and while his bodily powers were subservient to his will, libidinous and debauched.(39) Yet it was his happy lot, in the last years of his short life, through the admonition especially of *Gilbert Burnet*, to betake himself to the mercy of God and Jesus Christ; and he met death religiously, A.D. 1680, penitently lamenting and detesting his former wickedness.(40) In this list may be placed *Anthony Ashly Cooper*, earl of Shaftesbury, who died of a consumption at Naples, A.D. 1703: not that he was an open enemy of Christianity, but his pungent wit, the elegance of his style, and the charms of his genius, rendered him the more dangerous foe to religion, in proportion to the concealment he practised. Various of his works are extant, and have been often published; all exquisitely fine, from the native charms of his diction and

See *Henke*, Kirchengeschichte, vol. iv., p. 399, note.—*Tr.*]

(37) In defence of *Hobbes*, appeared, besides others, *Nic. Hieron. Gundling*, Observ. Selectæ, tom. i., n. ii., p. 30, and in the Gundlingiana, pt. xiv., p. 304. Add *Godfr. Arnold*, Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. ii., book xvii., ch. xvi., § 25, p. 1082, &c. Against these, appeared *Jo. Fran. Buddeus*, Theses de Atheismo et superstitione, cap. i., p. 187, &c.

(38) This rests on the authority of *Anthony Wood*; who states, in his Athenæ Oxon., vol. ii., p. 646, that *Hobbes* wrote an Apology for himself and his writings; in which he professes, never to have *embraced* the opinions he proposed in his Leviathan, but to have brought them forward merely to try his ingenuity; that, after writing the book, he never defended those opinions, either publicly or privately, but submitted them to the judgment of the church; that those positions of his book in particular, which seemed to militate against the received notions of God and religion, were published, not as true and incontrovertible, but only as plausible, and for the purpose of drawing forth the judgment of theologians concerning them. *Wood* does not tell us, in what year this Apology appeared; which is evidence that he had not been able to examine the book. Neither does he state, whether *Hobbes* was alive or dead, when it was published. But its being placed in the list of *Hobbes'* writings, posterior to 1682, leads to the conjecture that it was published after his death; for he died in 1679. It does not therefore yet appear, what we are to think of this change of opinion in *Hobbes*. I can believe, that such an Apology for *Hobbes* exists; but perhaps it was drawn up by one of his friends, to shield his reputation after he was dead. Yet if it was written and published by himself, it can afford but little support to those who would defend his character. For the method *Hobbes* takes to excuse himself, is that in which all try to clear themselves, when they have incurred odium and indignation by advancing corrupt and pernicious opinions, and yet wish to live quietly, though continuing to be just what they were before.

(39) See an account of his life and writings, in *Anthony Wood's* Athenæ Oxon., vol. ii., p. 654. On his poetic talents, *Voltaire* treats, Melange de litterature et de Philosophie, cap. xxxiv., in his Works, tom. iv., p. 303.

(40) This scene is described by *Gilbert Burnet*, in a special tract entitled: Some passages of the Life and Death of John earl of Rochester, written at his desire on his deathbed, by *Gilbert Burnet*, D.D. It is extant also in German, French, and Latin.

thoughts, yet exceedingly dangerous to young and inexperienced minds.(41) A rustic and coarse brawler, compared with these, was *John Toland*, an Irishman, who at the close of this century was not ashamed to disgrace himself and his country, by several tracts reproachful to Christianity. But as those who pamper the vicious propensities of men seldom lack admirers, so this man, who was not destitute of learning, though vainglorious and of abandoned morals, was thought something of by the undiscerning.(42) The other Englishmen of less notoriety, belonging to this class, need not be enumerated: yet if any one is disposed, he may add to the list *Edward Henry* [*Herbert*, baron] of Cherbury, a nobleman and philosopher, who, if he did not deny the divinity of the Christian religion, yet maintained that the knowledge of it was not necessary to salvation ;(43) and *Charles Blount*, the author of the Oracles of Reason, who committed suicide in 1693.(44)

§ 23. In France, adjacent to England, *Julius Cæsar Vanini* an Italian, author of the *Amphitheatre of Providence* and of *Dialogues concerning nature*, was publicly burned at Toulouse, in 1629 [1619], as a perverse ene-

(41) His works were first published collectively, London, 1711, in three volumes 8vo, and subsequently often. They are called *Characteristics*, [of Men, Manners, and Opinions], from the title of the greater part of them. See *Jo. le Clerc*, Bibliotheque Choisie, tome xxiii. Some notes of *Geo. Wilh. Leibnitz* upon them, were published by *Peter des Maizeaux*, Recueil des diverses pieces sur la Philosophie, tome ii., p. 245. There are some who maintain, that this otherwise great and illustrious man has been rashly accused, by clergymen, of contemning religion. I wish they could solidly evince that it is so. But if I do not wholly mistake, whoever shall read but a moderate portion of his writings, or only his noted Letter on Enthusiasm, which in French bears the title: Essay sur la raillerie, will readily fall in with the judgment which *Dr. Berkley* passes upon him, in his Alciphron or the Minute Philosopher, vol. i., dial. iii., p. 200, &c. This very ingenious man employs ridicule, when seeming to speak the most gravely on sacred subjects ; and divests the arguments, derived from the sacred scriptures in support of a devout and virtuous life, of all their power and influence : nay, by recommending an indescribable and sublime kind of virtue, far above the conceptions of common people, and which rests satisfied with itself, he appears to extinguish all zeal for the pursuit of virtue, in the minds of common people.

(42) In my younger years, I treated largely of this man, in a Commentatio de vita et scriptis ejus, prefixed to a Confutation of his insidious book entitled *Nazarenus*. The deficiencies, if any occur in that Commentatio, may be supplied from the Life of *Toland*, prefixed to his Posthumous Works published at London, 1726, 2 vols. 8vo. The author of that Life is *Peter des Maizeaux*, well known for various literary labours.

(43) Lord *Herbert* is sufficiently known to the learned, by his book de Causis errorum, and other writings ; but especially by his work de Religione Gentilium. And not less known, are the confutations of the sentiments he advances in these books ; written by *John Musæus*, *Christ. Kortholt*, and other celebrated divines. He is commonly considered the father of the family of *Naturalists* [or Deists]. See *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. ii., book xviii., ch. xvi., p. 1083, &c. [*Cherbury* is properly the founder of the modern religious *indifferentism*. If we may believe him, the divine origin of Christianity cannot be proved, but only be rendered very probable. The whole of religion, according to him, consists in *five* articles: I. There is a God. II. He is to be worshipped. III. And this, by the practice of virtue. IV. Repentance and reformation will procure us pardon from God. V. After this life, the virtuous will be rewarded, and the vicious punished.—*Schl.*]

(44) See *Chaufepied's* Nouveau Dictionnaire historique et crit., tome i., pt. ii., p. 328. He however omits his tragical death, from a regard undoubtedly to the feelings of the illustrious family of *Blounts*, still living in England.—[Concerning all the English deists mentioned in this section, their works, their opinions, and the confutation of them, see *John Leland's* View of the principal deistical writers that have appeared in England, in the last and present century, with Observations, &c., first published in 1754, and since, often, in 2 vols. 8vo.—*Tr.*]

my of God and of all religion. But some respectable and learned writers think, that he fell a victim to personal resentment; and that he neither wrote nor lived and acted, so stupidly and impiously, as to be justly chargeable with contemning God.(45) But the character of *Cosmo Ruggeri*, a Florentine and a profligate, who died at Paris in 1615, no honest man will readily undertake to defend. For when about to die, he boldly declared, that he regarded all that we are taught respecting a supreme Deity and evil spirits, as idle tales.(46) Whether justice or injustice was done to *Casimir Leszynsky*, a Polish knight who was punished capitally at Warsaw in 1689, for denying a God and divine providence, cannot easily be determined, without inspection of the record of his trial.(47) In Germany, a senseless and frantic man, *Matthew Knutzen* of Holstein, wished to establish a new sect of the *Conscientiaries*, that is, of persons who disregarding God, followed only the dictates of conscience or right reason: but he was easily checked, and compelled to abandon his mad project.(48)

§ 24. *Benedict de Spinoza*, a Portuguese Jew who died at the Hague in 1677, is accounted the first and the most acute of all those in this century, who transformed the Author of all things into a substance manacled by the eternal laws of necessity and fate. He indeed personally led a more discreet and commendable life, than an immense number of Christians and others do, who have never suffered a doubt to enter their minds respecting God and the duties men owe to him; neither did he seek to seduce others into a contempt for the Supreme Being, or into corrupt morals.(49) But

(45) See the compilations of *Jo. Fran. Buddeus* concerning him, in his Theses de Atheismo et Superstitione, cap. i., p. 120, &c. The author of the Apology for Vanini, which was published in Holland 1712, 8vo, was *Peter Fred. Arp*, a lawyer of extensive learning; who promised a new and much enlarged edition of this little book, in his Feriæ æstivales seu scriptorum suorum Historia, pt. i., § xl., p. 28, &c. His coadjutor in vindicating the character of Vanini, was *Elias Fred. Heister*, Apologia pro Medicis, sect. xviii., p. 93, &c. [*Vanini* was a physician, and a wild, enthusiastic naturalist. He travelled in England, the Netherlands, Germany, France, and Switzerland; professed himself a Catholic; but he advanced particularly in his last book, his *Dialogues*, such mystical and deistic opinions concerning God, whom he seemed to confound with nature, that he was burned as a heretic at Toulouse, A.D. 1619. See *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reformat., vol. v., p. 646, &c. *Brucker*, Hist. Crit. Philos., tom. v., p. 670; tom. vi., p. 922. *Chaufepied*, Dictionnaire, art. Vanini; and *Stäudlin's* Beytrage zur Phlos. u. Gesch., vol. i., p. 147.—*Tr.*]

(46) *Peter Bayle's* Dictionnaire, tome iii., p. 2526. [According to *Bayle*, he was a great astrologer, and soothsayer, and openly vicious.—*Tr.*]

(47) See *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. ii., book xvii., ch. xvi., § 14, p, 1074. The records of the trial of *Leszynsky* were formerly kept in the very rich library of *Zach. Conr. Uffenbach;* but where they are since removed to, I do not know. [Yet, from what *Arnold* has brought forward, it is more probable that he was innocent, than that he was guilty.—*Schl.*]

(48) See *Jo. Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. i., p. 304, &c., and his Isagoge ad Historiam Chersones. Cimbr., pt. ii., cap. vi, § viii., p. 164, &c. *Matur. Veiss. la Croze*, Entretiens sur divers sujets d'Histoire, p. 400, &c.

(49) His life, accurately written by *Jo. Colerus*, was published at the Hague, in the year 1706, 8vo. Yet a more full and circumstantial life of him, was composed by *Lenglet du Fresnoy*, and prefixed to *Boulainvillier's* Exposition of the doctrines of Spinoza, published at Brussels, or rather at Amsterdam, 1731, 12mo. Add *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire, tome iii., p. 2631. [He was born at Amsterdam in 1632, where his father, a Portuguese Jew, then resided as a trader. Educated among Jews, he early manifested talent, and also a propensity towards infidelity. He became a great admirer of Cartesian principles: and associated with men of education and philosophers. He was by trade a glass-grinder, and much famed for all kinds of optical glasses. His most noted works were, his Tractatus theo-

in his books, especially those published after his death, it is manifestly his aim to evince, that the whole universe and God himself, are precisely one and the same thing; and that whatever takes place, arises out of the eternal and immutable laws of *nature*, which necessarily existed and was active from all eternity. And if these things were so, it would follow, that every individual is himself God, and cannot possibly commit sin.(50) Beyond all controversy, it was the Cartesian philosophy to which he entirely resigned himself, that led *Spinoza* into these opinions. For, having adopted the common maxim of all philosophers, *that all things that truly exist*, (*all realities*), *exist superlatively in God;* and then assuming as indubitable, that opinion of *Des Cartes*, *that there are only two realities, thought and extension, the one peculiar to minds, and the other to matter;* it was natural and even necessary, that he should ascribe to God both these realities, *extension* and *thought*, without limitation or modification. And this done, it was unavoidable for him to confound *God* and the *universe*, as being one and the same nature; and to maintain, that there is only one real *substance*, from which all others originate and to which all return. Moreover *Spinoza's* system of doctrine, as even his friends will admit, was by no means such, as to captivate by its lucidnesss and the clearness of its evidence. For they tell us, it is to be comprehended by a kind of *feeling*, rather than by the understanding; and that even the greatest geniuses are in danger of misunderstanding it.(51) Among the disciples of *Spinoza*,

logico politicus, Hamburg, (Amsterdam), 1670, 4to, and Ethica ordine geometrico demonstrata, published soon after his death, 1677, 4to. His style is dry, argumentative, and rather obscure. Towards the close of the 18th century, some of the German theologians began to admire his writings; and at this time (1831), it is said, that a large number of the most pious divines of Germany, are Spinozists in philosophy.—*Tr.*]

(50) A pretty long list of those who have confuted *Spinoza*, is given by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Biblioth. Græca, lib. v., pt. iii., p. 119, &c., and by *Godfr. Jenichen*, Historia Spinozismi Lehnhofiani, p. 58–72. His real opinions concerning God, must be learned from his *Ethics*, which was published after his death; and not from his *Tractatus theologico-politicus*, which he published in his lifetime. For in the latter, he argues just as if he believed in an eternal Deity distinct from nature and matter, who had caused a system of religion to be promulgated, for imbuing men's minds with benevolence and equity, and had confirmed it by events, marvellous indeed, but not supernatural. But in his Ethics, he more clearly explains his views; and labours to prove, that nature itself is God, by its inherent powers necessarily producing movements. And this aids the confutation of those, who contend that *Spinoza* was not so bad a man as he is generally represented, and who adduce their proofs from his Tractatus theologico-politicus. Whether he gradually proceeded from bad to worse, or whether he cautiously concealed his real sentiments while he lived, from prudential reasons, it is difficult to say. This however is attested by the most credible witnesses, that so long as he was alive, he did not publicly influence any one to think lightly of God and his worship; and he always expressed himself, seriously and piously, when the conversation turned upon such subjects. See *Peter des Maizeaux*, Vie de Mr. de S. Evremond, p. cxvii., &c., tom. i., of the works of the latter. This may also be easily gathered from his Letters, which are extant among his Posthumous Works.

(51) *Peter Bayle*, whom no one will say was naturally obtuse and dull of apprehension, is charged by the followers of *Spinoza*, with not having well understood the sentiments of their master, and therefore with not having solidly refuted them. See his Dictionnaire, tome iii., p. 1641, note. *Lewis Meier* bitterly complains, in his Preface to the Posthumous Works of Spinoza, p. 21, &c., that there was a general misapprehension of the views of this extraordinary man, whose opinions all harmonized with the Christian religion. *Boulainvilliers* also, the expositor of Spinoza, declares in the Preface to a book soon to be mentioned, p. 153, that all his opposers had either maliciously perverted his meaning, or misunderstood it. Les refutations de Spinoza m'ont induit à juger, ou que leurs Auteurs n'avoient pas voulu mettre la doctrine, qu'ils combattent, dans une evidence

(who choose to be called *Pantheists*,(52) from the principal doctrine they embrace, rather than bear the name of their master), the first rank was held by *Lewis Meier*, a physician and a familiar friend of *Spinoza*,(53) also one *Lucas*,(54) the count *Boulainvilliers*,(55) and some others.

suffisante, ou qu'ils l'avoient mal entendue. If this system of doctrine is so difficult, so far above common comprehension, that even men of the greatest and most acute minds may easily mistake in stating it, what conclusion shall we make, but that the greater part of the Spinozists, (who are said to be very numerous all over Europe), have adopted it, not so much from any natural superiority of their genius, as from the hope of indulging their lusts with impunity? For no rational and well-informed man will believe, that in so great a multitude of persons, many of whom never once thought of improving their intellectual powers, all can see through that, which puzzles the most perspicacious.

(52) To relieve his poverty and satisfy his hunger, *John Toland* composed and published, at *Cosmopolis* (London), in 1720, 8vo, an infamous and corrupting book, entitled *Pantheisticon;* in which he exhibits the Formula celebrandæ Societatis Socraticæ seu Pantheisticæ ; that is, the mode of conducting meetings among the *Pantheists*, whom he represents as scattered every where ; and the morals of this faction are here graphically depicted. In this book,—than which none can be more pernicious to honest but unguarded minds,—the President and the members of the society of *Pantheists* confer with each other. *He* earnestly recommends to his associates and fellows attention to truth, liberty, and health ; and dissuades them from superstition, that is, religion ; and sometimes he reads to the brethren select passages from *Cicero* and *Seneca*, in which there is something favourable to irreligion. *They* solemnly promise, that they will obey his injunctions. Sometimes the whole company becomes so animated, that they simultaneously raise their voices, and sing merrily some verses from the ancient Latin poets, suited to their morals and principles. See *Maizeaux*, Life of John Toland, p lxxvii. Bibliotheque Angloise, tom. viii., pt. ii., p. 285. If the *Pantheists* are such as they are here represented, it is not for wise men to dispute with them, but for good magistrates to see to it, that such impudent geniuses do not creep into society, and seduce the minds of citizens from their duty.

(53) *Spinoza* employed this *Meier* as an interpreter, to translate into Latin what he wrote in Dutch. *Meier* also attended his dying master, and in vain attempted to heal his disease. And he moreover published the Posthumous Works of *Spinoza*, with a Preface, in which he endeavours without success to demonstrate, that *Spinoza's* doctrine contains nothing at variance with Christianity. He was also the author of the well-known book, entitled Philosophia Scripturæ interpres, Eleutheropoli, 1666, 4to, in which the dignity and authority of the sacred books are subjected entirely to the decisions of philosophy.

(54) *Lucas* was a physician at the Hague, noted for his panaceas, and for the obliquity of his morals. This flagitious man left a *Life of Spinoza*, from which *Lenglet du Fresnoy* drew the additions, that he made to the Life of Spinoza composed by *John Colerus*. There is also in circulation, and sold at a high price to those who can relish such writings, his Marrow of Spinoza's doctrine : L'esprit de Spinosa. Compared with this, what *Spinoza* himself wrote, will appear quite tolerable and religious ; so greatly has the wretched writer overleaped the bounds of all modesty, discretion, and good sense.

(55) This man, of a prolific but singular and unchastened genius, well known by his various works relating to the political history of France, by his *Life* or rather fable of *Mohammed*, by his misfortunes, and by other things ; was so inconsistent with himself, as to allow to both superstition and atheism nearly an equal place in his ill-arranged mind. For while he believed that there was no God but nature or the universe, he still had no hesitation to record *Mohammed*, as one whom God raised up to instruct mankind ; and he believed, that the future fortunes of individuals and of nations, might be learned from the stars. This man, from his great solicitude for the public good, was much troubled that the excellent doctrines of *Spinoza* were misunderstood, by almost every body ; and therefore he voluntarily assumed the task of expounding and stating them in a plain and lucid manner, suited to the comprehension of ordinary minds. His attempt succeeded ; but it produced only this effect, that all now perceived more clearly than before, that *Bayle* and the others who regarded the opinions of *Spinoza* as irrational in themselves and subversive of all religion and virtue, did not misjudge. His work merited eternal oblivion. But *Lenglet du Fresnoy* brought it before the public ; and that it might be bought and read with less suspicion, he gave it the false title of a *Confutation of Spinoza's doctrine ;* and added some tracts, really deserving that character, together with a

§ 25. How much and how happily all branches of literature, and the arts and sciences, as well those which belong to the province of reason and the intellect, as those which belong to the empire of invention, memory, and the imagination, were cultivated and advanced throughout Christendom in this century, appears from innumerable proofs, which need not here be detailed. The minds of men already awake, were farther excited near the beginning of this century, and they were sagaciously shown the path they should pursue, by that very great man, *Francis Bacon* lord Verulam, the Apollo of the English; and particularly in his books *on the Dignity and the advances of the Sciences*, and his *New Organ of the Sciences* (*de dignitate et augmentis scientiarum*, and *Novum Organum scientiarum*).(56) It would be vain indeed to expect, that mankind who are beset with a thousand obstructions to their seeing things nakedly and as they really are, should do all that he requires of the cultivators of science and literature; for this extraordinary man was sometimes borne away by his vast and intuitive genius, and required of men not what they are able to do, but what he could wish might be done. Yet it would be injustice to deny, that a great part of the advances which the Europeans made in every species of knowledge in this century, is ascribable to his counsels and admonitions; and especially, that those who had treated of physical and philosophical subjects, almost like blind men, by his assistance began gradually to open their eyes, and to philosophize in a wiser manner. And through his influence it was, I apprehend, that while most people in the preceding age supposed all human knowledge was carried to its perfection, by the study of the Greek and Latin classics and by an acquaintance with the liberal and elegant arts, many gradually ceased to think so, and saw that there were more wholesome aliments for the mind of a wise man.

§ 26. That the mathematical, physical, and astronomical sciences in particular, were carried to so great perfection among most of the nations of Europe, that those who lived before this period were comparatively but children in these sciences, is most manifest. In Italy, *Galileo Galilei*, supported by the grand dukes of Tuscany, led the way:(57) and there followed among the French, *René des Cartes*, *Peter Gassendi*, and innumer-

Life of Spinoza. The whole title of this dangerous book, is this: Refutation des erreurs de Bened. de Spinosa, par Mr. de *Fenelon*, Archevêque de Cambray, par le P. *Lami* Benedictin, et par Mr. le Comte de *Boulainvilliers*, avec la vie de Spinosa, écrite par Mr. *Jean Colerus*, augmentée de beaucoup de particularitez tirées d'une vie manuscrite de ce philosophe, faite par un de ses amis. (This was *Lucas*, of whom we spoke before.) A Bruxelles ches François Foppens, 1731, 12mo. Thus the wolf was penned among the sheep. *Boulainvilliers'* exposition and defence of *Spinoza's* doctrine, which, to deceive people, is called a *Refutation*, constitutes the greatest part of the book: nor is it placed last, as in the title-page, but occupies the foreground. The book also contains more than the title specifies. For the motley collection is closed by a work of *Isaac Orobio*, a Jewish philosopher and physician, (who held not the lowest place among the friends and disciples of *Spinoza*), entitled Certamen philosophicum propugnatæ veritatis divinæ ac naturalis adversus *Jo. Bredenburgii* principia. This work was printed at Amsterdam, 1703, 8vo.

(56) See his life prefixed to the late edition of his entire Works, Lond., 1740, fol., and the extracts from it, in the Bibliotheque Britanique, tome xv., pt. i., p. 128, &c. *Mallet's* Vie de François Bacon, Amsterd., 1742, 8vo, where, see especially his efforts to introduce a better mode of philosophizing, p. 6, 12, 50, 102, &c. Add *Voltaire's* Mêlange de litterature et de Philosophie, cap. xiv., p. 125, &c.

(57) See *Christ. August. Heumann's* Acta Philosophorum, written in German, pt. xiv., p. 261; pt. xv., p. 467; pt. xvii., p. 803.

able others; among the Danes, *Tycho Brahe;* among the English, besides others of less fame, *Robert Boyle*, and *Isaac Newton;* among the Germans, *John Kepler, John Hevelius, Godfr. Wm. Leibnitz;* and among the Swiss, the *Bernoulli*. To these men of the first order, so many others eagerly joined themselves, that there was no nation of Europe, except those which had not yet become civilized, which could not boast itself of some excellent and renowned geometrician, natural philosopher, or astronomer. Their ardour was stimulated, not only by the grand dukes of Tuscany, those hereditary patrons of all learning and especially of these branches, but also by the very powerful monarchs of France and Great Britain, *Charles* II. and *Louis* XIV. The former established in London, as the latter did in Paris, an academy or society of learned and inquisitive men, guarded against the contempt of the vulgar and the insidious influences of sloth, by very ample honours and rewards; whose business it was to examine nature most critically, and to cultivate all those arts, by which the human mind is rendered acute in discerning the truth, and in promoting the convenience and comfort of mankind.(58) This advance of learning has been exceedingly useful, not only to civil society but also to the Christian church. For by it the dominion of superstition, than which nothing can be more injurious to true religion or more dangerous to the safety of the state, has been greatly narrowed down; the strongest bulwarks have been erected against fictitious prodigies, by which people were formerly greatly affrighted; and the boundless perfections of the Supreme Being, especially his wisdom and his power, have been most solidly demonstrated, from the character and the structure both of the universe at large and of its individual parts.

§ 27. Much darkness was removed from the minds of Christians, by the knowledge of history and especially of early church history, which men of deep research in many places acquired and disseminated. For the origin and causes of a great number of opinions which antiquity and custom had rendered as it were sacred, being now historically exposed, numerous errors which before had occupied and enslaved men's minds, of course lost their authority, and light and peace arose upon many minds, and the lives of many were rendered more blameless and happy. This better knowledge of history likewise restored very many persons to a fair reputation, whom the ignorance or the malice of former ages had branded with the name of *heretics;* and this served to protect many pious and good men from being misled by the malignant and the ill-informed. History also showed, that various religious disputes which formerly embroiled nations, and involved them in bloodshed, rebellion, and crimes, arose from very trivial causes; from the ambiguity of terms, from ignorance, superstition, envy and emulation, or from the love of pre-eminence. It traced back many rites and ceremonies, which were once regarded as of divine origin, to polluted sources; to the customs of barbarous nations, to a disposition to practise imposition, to the irrational fancies of half-educated men, and

(58) A History of the Royal Society of London, was published by *Thomas Spratt*, London, 1722, 4to. See Bibliotheque Angloise, tom. xi., pt. i., p. 1, &c. ["A much more interesting and ample history of this respectable society has lately been composed and published by *Dr. Birch*, its learned secretary."—*Mael.*] A History of the Parisian Academy of Sciences, has been published by *Fontenelle*. A comparison between the two academies, is made by *Voltaire*, Mélange de litterature et de Philosophie, cap xxvi., in Opp., tome iv., p. 317.

to a foolish desire of imitating others. It taught, that the rulers of the church by base arts had possessed themselves of no small share of the civil power; and by binding kings with religious terrors, had divested them of their wealth. It evinced, that the ecclesiastical councils, whose decrees were once regarded as divine oracles, were often conventions of quite ignorant men, nay sometimes of arrant knaves. Several other things of the like nature might be mentioned. How salutary all this must have been to the cause of Christianity; how much gentleness towards those of different sentiments, how much caution and prudence in deciding upon the opinions of others, how much relief to the innocent and the good against the ill-disposed, grew out of it, and how many pernicious artifices, frauds, and errors, it has banished from human society, we may learn from our own daily experience of our happy condition.

§ 28. Those Christians, who gave attention to Hebrew and Greek literature, and to the languages and antiquities of the eastern nations, (and very many prosecuted these studies with great success), threw much light on numerous passages of the holy scriptures, which were before either dark and obscure, or misunderstood and erroneously adduced in support of opinions rashly taken up, nay made to teach error and false doctrine. And the consequence was, that the patrons of many vulgar errors and groundless opinions, were deprived of the best part of their armour. Nor will the wise and the good maintain, that there was no advantage to religion from the labours of such as either kept Latin eloquence from becoming extinct, or in imitation of the French, laboured to polish and improve the vernacular languages of their respective nations. For it is of great importance to the welfare and progress of the Christian community, that it should not lack men, who are able to write and to speak, properly, fluently, and elegantly, on all religious subjects; so that they may bring the ignorant, and those opposed to religion, to listen with pleasure to what they ought to learn, and readily to comprehend what they ought to know.

§ 29. The moral doctrines inculcated by Christ and his apostles, received a better form and more support against various abuses and perversions, after the law of nature or of right reason had been more critically investigated and better explained. The incomparable *Hugo Grotius*, stood forth a guide to others in this department, by his work *on the Rights of War and Peace* (*de Jure Belli et Pacis*): and the excellence and importance of the subject, induced a number of the best geniuses to follow him with alacrity.(59) How much aid the labours of these men afforded to all those who afterwards treated of the life and duties of a Christian, will be manifest to any one, that shall take the trouble to compare the treatises on this subject composed after their times, with those which were previously in estimation. It is certain, that the boundaries of Christian and natural morality were more accurately determined; some Christian duties, the nature of which was not well understood by the ancients, were more clearly defined; the great superiority of the divine laws, to the dictates of mere reason, was more lucidly shown; those general principles and solid grounds, by which all the Christian's doubts and conflicts respecting right and wrong in action may be easily settled, were established; and finally, the folly of those who audaciously maintained, that the precepts of Christianity were

(59) See *Adam Fred. Glafey's* History of the law of nature, written in German, and prefixed to a Bibliotheca of the law of nature and nations; Lips., 1739, 4to.

at variance with the dictates of sound reason, that they subverted nature, were calculated to undermine the prosperity of nations, rendered men effeminate, diverted them from the proper business of life, and the like, was vigorously chastised and refuted.

§ 30. But it is proper to make some particular remarks on the state of philosophy among Christians. At the commencement of this century, nearly all the philosophers were distributed into two sects; namely, that of the *Peripatetics*, and that of the *Fire-Philosophers* or the *Chymists*. And during many years, these two sects contended warmly for pre-eminence, and in a great number of publications. The Peripatetics held nearly all the professorial chairs both in the universities and the inferior schools, and they were furious against all that thought *Aristotle* should either be corrected or abandoned; as if all such had been traitors to their country, and public enemies of mankind. Most of this class however, if we except the professors at Tubingen, Helmstadt, Altorf, and Leipsic, did not follow *Aristotle* himself, but rather his modern expositors. The Chymical or Fire Philosophers roamed over nearly every country of Europe; assumed the obscure and deceptive title of *Rosecrucian Brethren*, (*Rosæcruciani Fratres*),(60) which had some apparent respectability, as it seemed to be de-

(60) It is abundantly attested, that the title of *Rosecrucians* was given to the Chymists, who united the study of religion with the search after chymical secrets. The term itself is chymical; nor can its import be understood, without a knowledge of the style used by the chymists. It is compounded, not as many think, of *rosa* and *crux* (a *rose* and the *cross*), but of *ros* (*dew*) and *crux*. *Dew* is the most powerful of all natural substances to dissolve gold. And a *cross*, in the language of the fire-philosophers, is the same as *Lux* (*light*); because the figure of a cross + exhibits all the three letters of the word *Lux* at one view. Moreover, this sect applied the term *Lux* to the *seed* or *Menstruum of the Red Dragon*, or to that crude and corporeal light, which being properly concocted and digested, produces gold. A *Rosecrucian* therefore, is a philosopher, who by means of *dew*, seeks for *light*, that is, for the substance of the philosopher's stone. The other interpretations of this name, are false and deceptive; and were invented and given out by the chymists themselves, who were exceedingly fond of concealment, for the sake of imposing on others that were hostile to their religious views. The true import of this title was perceived by the sagacity of *Peter Gassendi*, Examen philosophiæ Fluddanæ, § 15, in his Opp., tom. iii., p. 261. But it was more lucidly explained by the celebrated French physician, *Eusebius Renaudot*, Conferences publiques, tome iv., p 87. Very much, though ill arranged, respecting these Rosecrucian brethren who made so much noise in this century, their society, institutes, and writings, may be found in *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, part ii., book xvii., ch. xviii., p. 1114, &c. [According to most of the writers on the subject, the name *Rosecrucians* was not assumed by all the Fire-Philosophers; nor was it first applied to men of that description; but it was the appropriate name of an imaginary association, first announced about the year 1610, into which a multitude of Fire-Philosophers or alchymists, eagerly sought admission. The earliest writing professedly from them, was either published or republished at Frankfort, A.D. 1615, in German; and afterwards in Danish, Dutch, and Latin; and bore the title of "Fama Fraternitatis, or Discovery of the Brotherhood of the praiseworthy order of the Rosy-cross; together with the Confession of the same Fraternity; addressed to all the learned heads in Europe: also some answers, by Mr. Haselmeyer and other learned persons, to the Fama; together with a Discourse concerning a general reformation of the whole world." The next year, 1616, *David Mederus* wrote, "that, the *Fama Fraternitatis* and the *Confession* had then been, for *six* years, printed and dispersed in *five* languages." In the Fama, p. 15, &c., the founder and head of the fraternity, is said to have been one *Christopher Rosen-Creutz*, a German, born in the year 1388; who became a pilgrim, visited the holy sepulchre, and Damascus, where he was instructed by the wise men, and afterwards learned magic and the Cabala at Fez, and in Egypt; on his return to Germany, he undertook to improve human knowledge, and received several into his fraternity in order to commence

rived from the arms of *Luther*, which were a cross upon a rose; and in numberless publications, some of them more and some of them less able and severe, they charged the Peripatetics with corrupting and perverting both reason and religion. The leaders of the band were *Robert Fludd*.(61) an Englishman, of a singular genius; *Jacob Bœhmen*, a shoemaker of Gorlitz; and *Michael Mayer*.(62) These were afterwards succeeded by *Jo. Bapt. Helmont*, and his son, *Francis Mercurius*;(63) *Christian Knorr*, of Rosenroth;(64) *Quirin Kuhlmann*;(65) *Henry Noll*;(66) *Julius Sperber*;(67) and numerous others, but of unequal rank and fame. Harmony of opinion among this sort of people, no one would expect. For as a great part of their system of doctrine depends on a kind of internal sense, on the imagination, and on the testimony of the eyes and the ears,—than which

the business; and lived to the age of 100 years, a sage far in advance of the men of his age. This fraternity it was said, continued down to the time of these publications. A vast excitement was produced by this publication in 1615. Some declared in favour of the fabled Rosecrucian society, as a body of orthodox and learned reformers of the world; and others charged them with errors and mischievous designs. But in the year 1619, Dr. *Jo. Valentine Andreæ*, a famous Lutheran divine, published his "Tower of Babel, or chaos of opinions respecting the Fraternity of the Rosy-cross;" in which he represents the whole history as a farce; and gave intimations that *he* was *himself* concerned in getting it up. But many enthusiastic persons, especially among the Fire-Philosophers, continued to believe the fable; and professed to know many of the secrets of the society. Much continued to be written about them, for a long time: and indeed the whole subject is involved in great obscurity. See *Godfr. Arnold*, loc. cit., vol. ii., p. 244–258, ed. Schaffhausen, 1741. *H. P. K. Henke's* Gesch. der christl. Kirche, vol. iii., p. 509–511; and the authors there cited. For the origin and character of the *Theosophists* or *Fire-Philosophers*, see above, on the preceding century, p. 135, &c.—*Tr.*]

(61) For an account of this singular man, to whom our *Bœhmen* owed all his wisdom, see *Anth. Wood's* Athenæ Oxoniens., vol. i., p. 610, and Historia et Antiq. Acad. Oxoniensis, lib. ii., p. 390, &c. Concerning *Helmont* the father, see *Henn. Witte*, Memoriæ Philosophorum; and others. Respecting *Helmont* the son, see *Joach. Fred. Feller*, Miscellanea Leibnitianea, p. 226, and *Leibnitz's* Epistles, vol. iii., p. 353, 354. Concerning *Bœhmen*, see *Godfr. Arnold*, and various others. Respecting the rest, various writers must be consulted.

(62) See *Jo. Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. i., p. 376, &c. [He was a learned physician and chymist, wrote much, and ranked high as a physician and a good man. He died at Magdeburg, A.D. 1622, aged 54. —*Tr.*]

(63) [Concerning him, see *Brucker's* Hist. critica Philosophiæ, tom. iv., pt. i., p. 709, &c.—*Schl.*]

(64) [As *Brucker*, who gives account of the preceding Fire-Philosophers, is in every body's hands; while the history of *Knorr* of Rosenroth, must be derived from the more rare Nova Litteraria of *Krause*, Lips., 1718, p. 191, we shall here offer the reader a brief notice of him. *Christian Knorr* of Rosenroth was a Silesian nobleman; who, together with no ordinary knowledge of medicine, philology, and theology, possessed a particular acquaintance with chymistry and the Kabbala; and was privy counsellor and chancellor to *Christian Augustus*, the palsgrave of Sulzbach. He was born in 1636, and died in 1689. His most important work was his Kabbala denudata, in 2 vols. 4to, printed, vol. i., Sulzb., 1678, and vol. ii., Frankf. on Mayn, 1684. He also aided the publication of many Rabbinical works; and particularly of the book *Sohar*, at the Hebrew press in Sulzbach, 1684, fol.—*Schl.*]

(65) [See, concerning him, *Brucker*, loc. cit., p. 706. *Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhist., part iii., ch. xix., p. 197, &c.; and *Bayle's* Dictionnaire, article Kuhlmann.—*Schl.*]

(66) [He belonged to the gymnasium of Steinfurt in Westphalia, was afterwards professor of philosophy at Giessen, and at last, preacher at Darmstadt. He applied himself also to chymistry and medicine, and was a fellower of *Paracelsus*. He wrote, among other things, Systema hermeticæ medicinæ, and Physica hermetica; in which there are very many paradoxical propositions.—*Schl.*]

(67) [This man also belonged among the Rosecrucians. He was a counsellor at Anhalt-Dessau; and composed many Theosophic tracts, which were published at Amsterdam, in 1660 and 1662, 8vo. He died A.D. 1616.—*Schl.*]

nothing can be more fluctuating and fallacious; this sect of course, had almost as many disagreeing teachers, as it had writers of much note. There were however certain general principles, in which they all agreed. They all held, that the only way to arrive at true wisdom and a knowledge of the first principles of all things, was by analyzing bodies by the agency of fire. They all imagined, there was a sort of coincidence and agreement of religion with nature; and held, that God operates by the same laws in the *kingdom of grace*, as in the *kingdom of nature;* and hence they expressed their religious doctrines in chymical terms, as being appropriate to their philosophy. They all held, that there is a sort of *divine energy* or *soul* diffused through the frame of the universe; which some called *Archæus*, others the *universal spirit*, and others by various appellations. They all talked much and superstitiously, about (what they called) the *signatures of things*, about the power and dominion of the stars over all corporeal beings and even over men, and about magic and demons of various kinds. And finally, they all expressed their very obscure and inexplicable ideas, in unusual and most obscure phraseology.

§ 31. This contest between the chymical and the Peripatetic philosophers was moderated, and a new method of philosophizing was introduced, by two great men of France; namely, *Peter Gassendi*, professor of mathematics at Paris and canon of the church at Digne, a man of erudition, well acquainted with the belles lettres, eloquent also, and deeply versed in all branches of mathematics, astronomy, and other sciences; and *René des Cartes*, (*Renatus Cartesius*), a French chevalier and soldier, a man of an acute and subtle genius, but much inferior to *Gassendi* in literary and scientific acquirements. *Gassendi*, in the year 1624, forcibly and ingeniously attacked *Aristotle* and the Aristotelians, by publishing some *Exercitations against Aristotle;* but the work excited so much resentment and was procuring him so many enemies, that from his strong love of peace and tranquillity, he desisted from continuing the publication. Hence only two books of the work which he projected against Aristotle, were published; the other five, (for he intended to embrace the whole subject in seven books), were suppressed in their birth.(68) He likewise, in an appropriate work, attacked *Fludd*, and through him the *Rosecrucian* Brethren:(69) which was not unacceptable to the Aristotelians. At length he pointed out to others, though cautiously and discreetly, and himself entered upon, that mode of philosophizing, which ascends by slow and timid steps from what strikes the senses to what lies beyond their reach, and prosecutes the knowledge of truth by observation, attention, experiment, and reflection on the movements and the laws of nature; that is, from the contemplation of particular events and changes in nature, endeavours gradually to elicit some general ideas. In these inquiries, he called in the aid especially of the mathematics, as being the most certain of all sciences; and neglected metaphysics, the precepts of which he regarded as so dubious, that a man desirous to know truth, cannot safely confide in but very few of them.(70)

(68) See *Bougerell*, Vie de Gassendi, p. 17, 23.

(69) [The title of his book was: Examen philosophiæ Fluddanæ, sive Exercitatio epistolica, in qua principia philosophiæ Roberti Fluddi reteguntur, et ad recentes illius libros adversus Marinum Mersennum (a friend of *Gassendi*) scriptos respondetur, cum aliquot observationibus cœlestibus, Paris, 1630, 8vo —*Schl.*]

(70) Those who wish farther information on this subject, may consult his *Institutiones Philosophiæ;* a diffuse performance, which fills the two first volumes of his works, [pub-

§ 32. *Des Cartes* philosophized in a very different manner. For he abandoned the mathematics, which he at first had made his chief dependance, and betook himself to general ideas or to metaphysics, in order to come at that truth which was the object of his pursuit. Calling in the aid therefore of a few very simple positions, which the very nature of man seems almost to dictate to him spontaneously, he first endeavoured to form in his own mind distinct ideas of souls, bodies, God, matter, the universe, space, and of the principal objects of which the universe is composed. Combining these ideas together, and reducing them to a scientific form or system, he applied them to the correction, improvement, and solid establishment of the other parts of philosophy; always taking care, that what followed or was brought out last, should coincide with what went before and appear to arise spontaneously from it. Scarcely had he brought his reflections before the public, when a considerable number of discerning men in most countries of Europe, who had been long dissatisfied with the dust and darkness of the schools, approved and embraced his views, and wished to see *Des Cartes* recommended to the studious youth, and the Peripatetics set aside. On the other hand, the whole tribe of Peripatetics, aided by the clergy who feared that religion was in danger from some secret plot, raised a prodigious dust to prevent the new philosophy from supplanting the old; and to carry on the war with better success, they bitterly taxed the author of it, not only with the grossest errors, but also with downright Atheism. This will appear the less surprising, if we consider that the Aristotelians fought, not so much for their system of philosophy as for their personal interests, their honours and emoluments. The Theosophists, Rosecrucians, and Chymists seemed to enter into the contest with more calmness: and yet there was not one of them, who did not regard the doctrines of the Peripatetics, vain and injurious to piety as they were, as far more tolerable than the Cartesian discoveries.(71) The result of this long contest finally was, that the wiser part of Europe would not indeed give themselves up entirely to the philosophy of *Des Cartes* alone, yet in conformity with his example, they resolved to philosophize more freely than before, and to renounce their servitude to *Aristotle*.

§ 33. The great men contemporary with *Des Cartes*, very generally applauded his plan and purpose of philosophizing without subjecting himself to a guide or master, of proceeding circumspectly and slowly from the first dictates of nature and reason to things more complex and difficult, and of admitting nothing till it was well examined and understood. Nor was there an individual who did not acknowledge, that he was the author of many brilliant and very useful discoveries and demonstrations. But some of them looked upon his positions respecting the causes and principles of natural things, as resting for the most part on mere conjectures; and considered the groundwork of his whole system, namely, his definitions or ideas of God, the first cause, of matter and spirit, of the essential nature of things, of motion and its laws, and of other similar subjects, as either

lished by *Sorbierre*, in 6 vols. fol., A.D. 1658]. Throughout these Institutes, it seems to be his main object to show, that the opinions of the philosophers, both ancient and modern, on most subjects, derived by them from the precepts of metaphysics, have little of certainty and solidity.

(71) Here should be read, besides the others who have written the history of *Des Cartes* and his philosophy, *Hadrian Baillet's* Life of Des Cartes, in French, printed at Paris, 1691, 2 vols. 4to. Add the Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. et Crit., tome ii., p. 39.

uncertain, or leading to dangerous errors, or contrary to experience. At the head of these, was his countryman, *Peter Gassendi;* who had attempted to lower the credit of the Aristotelians and the Chymists, before *Des Cartes;* and who was his equal in genius, much his superior in learning, and most expert in all the branches of mathematics. He endeavoured to overthrow those metaphysical principles, which *Des Cartes* had made the foundation of his whole system; and in opposition to his natural philosophy, he set up another which was not unlike the old Epicurean, but far more perfect, better, and more solid, and founded not on mental conceptions, but on experience and the testimony of the senses.(72) The followers of this new and very sagacious teacher were not numerous, and were far outnumbered by the Cartesian host; yet it was a select band, and pre-eminent for attainments and ardour in mathematical and physical knowledge. Among his countrymen *Gassendi* had few admirers; but among their neighbours, the English, who at that time were much devoted to physical and mathematical studies, he had a larger number of adherents. Even those English philosophers and theologians who combated *Thomas Hobbes*, (whose doctrines more resembled those of *Gassendi*, than they did those of *Des Cartes*), and who in order to confute Hobbes revived the Platonic philosophy, such as *William* [*Benjamin*] *Whichcot*, *Theophilus Gale*, *Ralph Cudworth*, *Henry Moore*, and others, did not hesitate to associate *Plato* with *Gassendi*, and to put such a construction upon the latter as would make him appear the friend of the former.(73)

§ 34. From this time onward, Christendom was divided by two distinguished sects of philosophers; who, though they had little dispute about things of most practical utility in human life, were much at variance respecting the starting points in all philosophical reasoning, or the foundations of all human knowledge. The one may not improperly be called the *metaphysical* sect, and the other the *mathematical;* nor would the leaders in these schools, probably, reject these appellations. The former trod in the footsteps of *Des Cartes;* the latter preferred the method of *Gassendi*. *That* supposed, truth was to be discovered by reasoning; *this*, rather by experiments and observation. *That* placed little dependance on the senses, and trusted more to reflection and ratiocination; *this* placed less dependance on reasoning, and relied more on the senses and the actual inspection of things. *That* deduced from a few metaphysical principles, a long list of dogmas; by which it affirmed, a way was opened for acquiring a certain and precise knowledge of the nature of God, of souls, of bodies, and of the entire universe: *this*, did not indeed reject the principles of metaphysics, but it denied their sufficiency for constructing an entire system of philos-

(72) See, in particular, his Disquisitio metaphysica, seu Dubitationes et Instantiæ adversus Cartesii metaphysicam et responsa; which was first published in 1641, and is inserted in the third volume of his Works, p. 283, &c. A neat compendium of his whole system of philosophy, was drawn up by *Francis Bernier*, a celebrated French physician: Abregé de la philosophie de Gassendi, Lyons, 1684, 8 vols. 12mo. From this compendium, the views of this great man may be more easily learned than from his own writings, which are not unfrequently designedly ambiguous and equivocal, and likewise overloaded with various learning. The Life of *Gassendi* was not long since carefully written by *Bougerell*, one of the Fathers of the Oratory, Paris, 1737, 12mo, concerning which, see Biblioth Françoise, tome xxvii, pt. ii., p. 353, &c.

(73) See the remarks we have made, in the Preface to *Cudworth's* Intellectual System, g. 2 a., and in many places of our *Notes* to that work: [in the Latin translation, by *Dr. Mosheim.—Tr.*]

ophy; and contended on the contrary, that long experience, a careful inspection of things, and experiments often repeated, were the best helps to the attainment of solid and useful knowledge. *That* boldly soars aloft, to examine the first cause and source of truth, and the natures and causes of all things, and returning with these discoveries, descends to explain by them the changes that take place in nature, the purposes and the attributes of God, the character and duties of men, and the constitution and fabric of the universe: *this*, more timid and more modest, first inspects most attentively the objects which meet the eye, and which lie as it were at our feet; and then ascends to inquiries into the nature and causes of things. *That* supposes very much to be perfectly well understood; and therefore is very ready to attempt reducing its knowledge into the form of a regular and complete system: *this* supposes innumerable things to elude our grasp; and instructs its followers to suspend all judgment on numberless points, until time and experience shall throw more light upon them; and lastly, it supposes that the business of making out complete *systems* as they are called, either entirely exceeds the ability of mortals, or must be left to future generations who shall have learned far more from experience than we have. This disagreement respecting the first principles of all human knowledge or science, has produced much dissension respecting subjects of the greatest importance, such as the character of God, the nature of matter, the elements of bodies, the laws of motion, the mode of the divine government or providence, the constitution of the universe, the nature and mutual relations of souls and bodies: and the wise, who reflect upon the subject matter of these disputes and upon the habits and dispositions of human minds, are fearful that these controversies will continue and be perpetual.(74) At the same time, good men would be less troubled about these contests, if the parties would show more moderation, and would not each arraign the other as chargeable with a grievous offence against God and as subverting the foundations of all religion.(75)

§ 35. All those who either embraced the sentiments of *Des Cartes*, or

(74) *Voltaire* published a few years since: La Metaphysique de Neuton, ou parallèle des sentimens de Neuton et de Leibnitz, Amsterd., 1740, 8vo, which little book, though not so accurately written as it should be, nor a complete treatise on the subject, will yet be not a little serviceable to those who wish to know how much these philosophic schools disagree.

(75) It is well known, that *Des Cartes* and his followers, the metaphysical philosophers, were formerly accused by vast numbers, and they are still accused, of subverting all religion and piety. In the list of *Atheists unmasked*, by *Jo. Harduin*, (Œuvres Melées, p. 200, &c.), *René des Cartes*, with his principal and most noble followers, *Anthony le Grand* and *Silvanus Regis*, hold a conspicuous place. Nor is the name of *Franc. Nich. Malebranche*, though many think him nearer allied to the fanatics, excluded from this black catalogue. (See p. 43.) It is true, that *Harduin* very often talks like one delirious; but he does not here follow his own genius, but adopts the views of the Peripatetic and Mathematical sects, who more fiercely than others assailed the Cartesian philosophy. And even very recently *Voltaire*, though he is much more moderate, yet not obscurely assents to these accusations. (*Metaphysique* de Neuton, cap. i., p. 3, &c.) Nor were the Metaphysical philosophers more temperate towards their adversaries. Long since, *Anthony Arnauld* considered *Gassendi* in his dispute against *Des Cartes*, as subverting the immortality of the soul. And *Godf. Wilh. Leibnitz* added, that the whole of natural religion was corrupted and shaken by him. See *Maizeaux*. Recueil des diverses pieces sur la philosophie, tome ii., p. 166. Nor does *Leibnitz* hesitate to declare, that *Isaac Newton* and his adherents rob God of his best attributes and perfections, and rip up the foundations of natural religion. And most of the writings of both parties quite down to our times, are full of such criminations.

adopted his rules of philosophizing, endeavoured to elucidate, confirm, amend, and perfect the metaphysical method in philosophy. And these persons were very numerous in this century, especially in Holland and France. But as some of this description not obscurely undermined religion and the belief of a God, of which class *Benedict de Spinoza* was the ringleader, and as others of them abused the precepts of their master to pervert and overthrow certain doctrines of religion, as e. g., *Balthazar Becker*, hence in various places, the whole school became extremely odious. There were none who pursued the metaphysical method more wisely, and at the same time more acutely, than *Francis Nicholas Malebranche*, and *Godfrey William Leibnitz;* the former, a Frenchman, and one of the *Fathers of the Oratory*, a man equally eloquent and acute; the latter, a German, to be ranked with the first genius of any age.(76) Neither of them indeed, received all the dicta of *Des Cartes*, but they adopted his general method of philosophizing, added many opinions of their own, altered and improved many things, and confirmed others with more solid arguments. *Malebranche* yielded too much to his very fertile imagination; and therefore he often inclined towards those who are agreeably deceived by the visions of their own creation. *Leibnitz* depended entirely on his reason and judgment.

§ 36. The *mathematical* philosophy already mentioned, had a much smaller number of followers and friends: the causes of which, will readily occur to those disposed to inquire for them. But it found a new country affording it protection, namely Great Britain; the philosophers of which perceiving in its infantile and unfinished features a resemblance of the great *Francis Bacon* lord Verulam, took it into their arms, cherished it, and to our times have given it fame. The whole Royal Society of London, which is almost the public school of the nation, approved of it; and with no less expense than pains and patience, improved and extended it. In particular, it is very much indebted for its progress to those immortal men, *Isaac Barrow*, *John Wallis*, *John Locke*, and him who should have been named first, *Robert Boyle*, a very religious gentleman, much noted among other things for his very learned works. The theologians also of that country,—a class of men whom philosophers are wont to charge with violently opposing their measures,—deemed it not only sound and harmless, but likewise most useful to awaken and to cherish feelings of reverence for the Deity, and to support and defend religion, and most consonant with the decisions of the holy scriptures and the primitive church. And hence, all those who publicly assailed the enemies of God and religion in the Boylian lectures, descended into the arena clad in its armour, and wielding its weap-

(76) Concerning *Malebranche*, the author of the interesting work entitled, *Search after Truth* [*Recherche de la Verité*, Paris, 1673, 3 vols. 12mo, also translated into English, in 1 vol. fol.—*Tr.*], and of other metaphysical works; see *Fontenelle*, Elogès des Academiciens d l'Acadamie Royale des sciences, tome i., p. 317, &c For what is reprehensible in his philosophy, see *Jo. Harduin's* Atheists unmasked, in his Œuvres Melées, p. 43, &c. The life and doctrines of *Leibnitz* are described by the same *Fontenelle*, loc. cit., tome ii., p. 9. But his history and his philosophy, are the most copiously described by *Charles Gunther Ludovici*, in his History of the Leibnitian philosophy, written in German, 2 vols., Lips., 1737, 8vo. The genius of this great man, may be the most satisfactorily learned by reading his *Epistles*, published by *Christ. Kortholt*, in 3 vols. 8vo. Leipsic; and afterwards by others. Nor is it necessary I should here draw his portrait.

ons. But by the ingenuity and diligence of no one, have its increase and progress been more aided, than by those of *Isaac Newton;* a man of the highest excellence, and venerable even in the estimation of his opposers: for he spent the whole of his long life in digesting, correcting, amplifying, and demonstrating it, both by experiments and by computations; and with so much success, that from being only silver, it seemed to become gold in his hands.(77) The English say, that the excellence and the superior value of this philosophy, may be learned from this fact, that all those who have devoted themselves wholly to it, have left behind them bright examples of sanctity and solid piety; while on the other hand, many of the metaphysical philosophers have been entirely estranged from God and his worship, and were teachers and promoters of the greatest impiety.

§ 37. But although these two illustrious schools had deprived the ancient ones of their pupils and their reputation, yet all the philosophers would not join themselves to one or the other of them. For liberty of thinking for themselves being obtained, some men of superior genius and acumen, and some also whose imaginations were stronger than their judgments, ventured to point out new ways for coming at latent truths. But nearly all of them failed of obtaining many followers; so that it will be sufficient, to just glance at the subject. There were some whose mediocrity of talents, or whose native indolence of character, deterred them from the difficult and laborious task of investigating truth by the efforts of their own minds, and who therefore attempted to collect and to compact into a kind of system, the best and most satisfactory principles admitted by all the schools. These are commonly denominated *Eclectics.* And finally, from these very disagreements and contests of the philosophers, some very acute men took occasion to despair of finding the truth, and for again opening the long closed school of the *Skeptics.* Among these, the more distinguished were *Francis Sanches,* a physician of Toulouse,(78) *Francis de la Mothe le Vayer,*(79) *Peter Daniel Huet* bishop of Avranches,(80) and some others. It is common, and not altogether without reason, to place among this class *Peter Bayle;*(81) who acquired high reputation in the latter part of this century, by various works rich in matter, and elegant in style.

(77) This great man's Elementa philosophiæ mathematicæ often printed, and his other writings, philosophical and mathematical and also theological, are of great notoriety. His life and merits are elegantly described by *Fontenelle;* Elogés des Academiciens de l'Academie Royale des sciences, tome ii., p. 293–323. Add Biblioth. Angloise, tome xv., pt. ii., p. 545, and Biblioth. raisonnée, tome vi., pt. ii., p. 478.

(78) There is a celebrated work of his, entitled: De eo, quod nihil scitur; which, with his other tracts, and his Life, was published at Toulouse, 1636, 4to. See *Bayle's* Dictionnaire, tome iii., p. 2530, and *Peter de Villemandy's* Skepticismus debellatus, cap. iv., p. 32.

(79) See *Bayle's* Dictionnaire, tome iv., art. *Vayer*, p. 2780, &c.

(80) His book on the Weakness of Human Reason, was published after his death, both in French, Amsterd., 1723, 8vo. and recently in Latin. But it appears, that long before this book was either published or written, *Huet* had recommended the mode of philosophizing adopted by the skeptics; and thought this alone best suited to establish the Christian religion. See his Commentarius de rebus ad eum pertinentibus, lib. iv., p. 230, and his Demonstratio Evangelica, Preface, § iv., p. 9, where he approves the measures of those, who first enervate all philosophy and expel it from the mind, by skeptical arguments, before they prove to the doubting the truth of Christianity. We are aware that the Jesuits, to whom *Huet* was much inclined, formerly adopted with success, and do still adopt this very hazardous artifice, in order to draw over Protestants to the Romish community.

(81) Who at this day can be unacquainted with *Bayle?* His Life, copiously written

SECTION II.

THE PARTICULAR HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

PART I.

THE HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORY OF THE ROMISH OR LATIN CHURCH.

§ 1. The Sovereign Pontiffs of this Century.—§ 2. Solicitude of the Romish Church to oppress the Protestants.—§ 3. Commotions in Austria and Bohemia.—§ 4. The Bohemian War. Frederic V. defeated.—§ 5. Progress of the Bohemian German War.—§ 6. Gustavus Adolphus arrives. Termination of the Thirty Years' War.—§ 7. The Peace of Westphalia.—§ 8 Injuries done to Protestants by the Romanists.—§ 9. The Moors driven out of Spain. Oppression of the Reformed in France.—§ 10. Attempts upon England fail.—§ 11. Milder Measures of the Papists to overcome the Protestants.—§ 12. Theological Conferences attempted.—§ 13. The Popish Pacificators.—§ 14. Pacificators on the side of the Protestants.—§ 15. The Popish Methodists.—§ 16. Protestant Apostates.—§ 17. Losses of the Romish Church in the East.—§ 18. Authority of the Pontiffs gradually diminished.—§ 19. Controversy of Paul V. with the Venetians.—§ 20. War with the Portuguese.—§ 21. Contests of the French with the Pontiffs.—§ 22. Lewis XIV. in particular.—§ 23. State of the Romish Clergy.—§ 24. The Monks.—§ 25. The Congregation of St. Maur.—§ 26. Port Royal. Reformed Bernardins de la Trappe.—§ 27. New Sects of Monks.—§ 28. The Jesuits.—§ 29. State of Literature in the Romish Church.—§ 30. Philosophy.—§ 31. Merits of the Jesuits, the Benedictines, the Fathers of the Oratory, and the Jansenists.—§ 32. The principal Writers.—§ 33. The Romish Religion corrupted still more.—§ 34. Morality subverted by the Jesuits.—§ 35. Condition of Exegetic Theology.—§ 36. Dogmatic, Moral, and Polemic Theology.—§ 37. Contest of the Jesuits and Dominicans respecting the Aids of Grace, under Clement VIII.—§ 38. Its continuation under Paul V. and its Issue.—§ 39, 40. Commencement of the Jansenists.—§ 41. Arguments and Measures of both Parties.—§ 42. Five Propositions condemned by Innocent X.—§ 43. Bull of Alexander VII. against Jansenius.—§ 44. Peace of Clement IX. Subsequent Events.—§ 45. Austere Piety of the Jansenists.—§ 46. The Convent of Port Royal.—§ 47. Controversy respecting the Immaculate Conception of St. Mary.—§ 48. Quietistic Controversy. Molinos.—§ 49. His followers.—§ 50. Madam Guyon. Fenelon.—§ 51. La Peyrere, White, Sfondrati, and Borri.—§ 52. Canonizations.

§ 1. At the commencement of this century, the Romish church was governed by *Clement* VIII. [A.D. 1592–1605], whose former name was *Aldobrandini*, and who reigned in the close of the preceding century.

in two volumes 8vo, by *Peter des Maizeaux*, was published at the Hague in 1732, [and is prefixed to the fifth edition of his Dictionnaire Hist. et Critique; Basle, 1738, 4 tomes fol.] His skepticism was most clearly shown, and confuted with great dexterity, by *Jo. Peter de Crousaz*, in a very copious French work [Examen du Pyrrhonisme]; a neat abridgment of which was made by *Sam. Formey*, [Le Triomphe de l'Evidence], and translated from French into German, by *Alb. Haller*, Gotting., 1750, 8vo. [See also *Bayle's* own answer to this and other charges brought against him, subjoined to the fifth edition of his Dictionnaire, tome iv., p. 616, &c.—*Tr.*]

That he possessed genius and cunning, and was very zealous for suppressing Protestantism and extending the Romish church, all admit: but whether he had all the prudence necessary for a sovereign pontiff, many have questioned. He was succeeded [during 27 days], in the year 1605, by *Leo* XI. of the family of Medicis; who died at an advanced age, on the very year of his elevation, and left the Romish chair to *Paul* V. of the family of Borghese, [1605–1621], who was a man of violent passions, and frequently a most insolent asserter of his prerogatives; as appears among other things, from his rash and unsuccessful conflict with the Venetians. In *Gregory* XV. [1621–1623], of the family of *Ludovici*, who was elected in 1621, there was more moderation than in *Paul* V., but no more gentleness towards those who forsook the Romish church. This however is the common and almost necessary fault of all the Roman pontiffs, who without it, could scarcely fulfil the high duties of their office. *Urban* VIII. of the family of *Barberini*, [1623–1644], whom the favour of the cardinals placed in the Romish chair in 1623, showed himself very favourable and liberal to learned and literary men, being himself well versed in literature and an excellent writer both in prose and verse;(1) but towards the *Protestants*, he was extremely cruel and harsh. Yet *Urban* will appear kind and good, if compared with *Innocent* X. [1644–1655], of the family of *Pamphili*, who succeeded him in 1644. For he was ignorant of all those things, of which ignorance is least excusable in heads of the church; and surrendered up himself and all public affairs civil and sacred, to the control of *Olympia* his kinswoman, a most vicious creature, avaricious, and insolent.(2) His very zealous efforts to prevent the peace of Westphalia, I do not think we should reckon among his peculiar crimes; because, if I am not greatly mistaken, the best of pontiffs would have done the same. His successor

(1) See *Leo. Allatius*, Apes Urbanæ: which little book was republished by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius* at Hamburg. It is a full catalogue of the learned and excellent men, who adorned Rome in the pontificate of *Urban* VIII., and who experienced the liberality of that pontiff. The neat and elegant Latin poems of this pontiff have been often printed. [These poems were written, while he was a cardinal. Under him, nepotism greatly prevailed; and the political transactions of his court, are ascribable more to his nephews and family than to him. He procured a very distinguished edition of the Romish Breviary; suppressed the order of female Jesuits; conferred the title of *Eminence* on the cardinals, and on all cardinal-legates, on the three clerical German electors, and on the grand master of the order of Malta.—*Schl.*]

(2) Memoires du Cardinal *de Rhetz*, tome iii., p. 102, &c., newest edition. Add vol. iv., p. 12. Respecting his contests with the French, see *Bougeant's* Histoire de la paix de Westphalie, tome iv., p. 56, &c. [Respecting *Olympia*, see La Vie d'Olympe Maldachini princesse Pamfili, trad. de l'Italien de l'Abbé *Gualdi*, avec des notes par *M. L.*, Geneva, (or rather, Paris), 1770, 12mo. The original was published in 1666, 12mo. *Innocent* before his election, had lived in free commerce with *Olympia;* which was continued after his elevation, and was carried to such lengths that the Donna, under the reign of her dear brother-in-law, possessed all power, sold all offices and prebends, gathered money in a thousand ways, opened the despatches of the envoys, and guided and controlled all state affairs. She suppressed nearly 2000 minor cloisters, and thereby obtained vast sums; and other cloisters, threatened with the same fate, had to purchase their freedom. She was for some time excluded from the palace, and removed from the court, by cardinal *Pancirolla* and his creature the pretended cardinal *Pamphili*, whose proper name was *Astalli* and who had no connexion with the pope. But she soon after returned to her old place, and was the absolute mistress of the Vatican, where she at last took up her residence: indeed the unfriendly chroniclers say, that one of her earrings was found in the pope's bed. And such was the pontiff, who persuaded *Ferdinand* III. to hold the sword always drawn over the Protestants, who condemned *Jansenius*, and who entered his dissent against the peace of Westphalia.—*Schl.*]

in 1655, *Alexander* VII., previously *Fabius Chigi*, [A.D. 1655–1667], is deserving of a little more commendation. Yet he was not lacking in any of those stains, which the pontiffs cannot wash off and yet preserve their rank and authority; and discerning and distinguished men even in the Romish church, have described him as possessing slender talents, inadequate to the management of great affairs, an insidious disposition, and the basest instability.(3) The two *Clements* IX. and X., who were elected, the one in 1668 and the other in 1669, [1670–1676], performed little worth recording for posterity. The former was of the family of *Rospigliosi*, and the latter of that of *Altieri*.(4) *Innocent* XI., previously *Benedict Odeschalcus*, who ascended the papal throne in 1677, [1676–1689], acquired a high and permanent reputation, by the strictness of his morals, his uniformity and consistency, his abhorrence of gross superstition, his zeal to purge religion of fables and reform the clergy, and by other virtues. But his example most clearly shows, that much may be attempted and but little accomplished, by pontiffs who have quite sane views and upright intentions; and that the wisest regulations cannot long resist the machinations of such a multitude of persons, fostered and raised to power and influence by licentiousness of morals, pious frauds, fables, errors, and worthless institutions.(5) At least, nearly all the praiseworthy regulations and enact-

(3) See the Memoires du Card. de *Rhetz*, tome iv., p. 16, &c., p. 77, who very sagaciously decides many points respecting him: also Memoires de *Mr. Joly*, tome ii., p. 186, 210, 237, who speaks equally ill of Alexander: and the celebrated *Arkenholz*, Memoires de la Reine Christine, tome ii., p. 125, &c. ["The craft and dissimulation attributed to this pontiff, really constituted an essential part of his character; but it is not strictly true, that he was a man of a *mean genius*, or unequal to *great and difficult undertakings*. He was a man of learning, and discovered very eminent abilities at the treaty of Munster, where he was sent in the character of nuncio. Some writers relate, that, while he was in Germany, he had formed the design of abjuring popery, and embracing the Protestant religion; but was deterred from the execution of his purpose by the example of his cousin, count *Pompey*, who was poisoned at Lyons, on his way to Germany, after he had abjured the Romish faith. These writers add, that *Chigi* was confirmed in his religion by his elevation to the cardinalship. See *Bayle*, Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres, Octob., 1688."—*Macl.*]

(4) Memoires de la Reine Christine, tome ii., p. 126, 131. [*Clement* IX. was a ruler fond of peace and splendour, a foe to nepotism, and a beneficent friend to his subjects. *Clement* X. was no less fond of peace than his predecessor; but he introduced a peculiar kind of nepotism, by adopting as his son the cardinal *Paolucci*. Yet his six years' reign exhibited nothing remarkable.—*Schl.*]

(5) See the Journal Universel, tome i., p. 441, &c., tome vi., p. 306. The present pontiff, *Benedict* XIV., attempted in the year 1743, to enrol *Innocent* XI. among the saints. But *Louis* XV. king of France, influenced it is said, by the Jesuits, resisted the measure; because *Louis* XIV. had had much controversy with this pontiff; as we shall state hereafter. [It is a noticeable circumstance in his life, that in the thirty years' war he served in Germany as a soldier; and there is still shown at Wolfenbuttle, the house in which as an officer he is said to have resided. This circumstance indeed, the count *Turrezonico* has called in question, in his work de suppositiis stipendiis militaribus Bened. Odeschalchi, Como, 1742, fol. But *Heumann* has placed the fact beyond all doubt; in the Hannöverisch. nüzlichen Samnlungen, 1755, p. 1185; and in the Beyträge von alten u. neuen theologischen Sachen, 1755, p. 882. He however afterwards assumed the sacred office; and even on the papal throne, exhibited the virtues of a military commander, courage, strictness, and inflexibility of purpose. He sought to diminish the voluptuousness and splendid extravagance of his court, to correct all abuses among the clergy, and to extirpate nepotism. But he often went too far, and his reforming zeal frequently extended to things indifferent. For instance, he wished to prohibit the clergy from taking snuff, and the ladies from learning music; and the like. And in this way, he would have hindered the good effects of his zeal for reformation, if he had met with no obstructions to be

ments of *Innocent*, fell to the ground and were overthrown, by the indolence and the yielding temper of *Alexander* VIII. of the *Ottoboni* family, who was created pope in the year 1689, [A.D. 1689–1691].(6) *Innocent* XII., of the family of *Pigniatelli*, a good man and possessed of fine talents, who succeeded *Alexander* in the year 1691, [A.D. 1691–1700], wished to restore the regulations of *Innocent* XI. to their authority; and he did partially restore them. But he too, had to learn, that the wisest and most vigorous pontiffs are inadequate to cure the maladies of the court and church of Rome; nor did posterity long enjoy the benefits he had provided for them.(7) Quite at the end of the century, 1699, [A.D. 1700–1721], *Clement* XI., of the family of *Albani*, was placed at the head of the Romish church. He was clearly the most learned of the cardinals, and not inferior to any of the preceding pontiffs in wisdom, mildness, and desire to reign well. Yet he was so far from strenuously opposing the inveterate maladies and the unseemly regulations of the Romish church, that indiscreetly, and as he supposed for the glory and security of the church, i. e., of the head of it, he rather admitted many things, which conduce to its dishonour, and which show that even the better sort of pontiffs, through their zeal to preserve or to augment their dignity and honour, may easily fall into the greatest errors and faults.(8)

§ 2. The great pains taken by the Romish church to extend their power among the barbarous nations that were ignorant of Christianity, have been already noticed. We have therefore now, only to describe their care and efforts to recover their lost possessions, or to bring the Protestants under subjection. And for this, their efforts were astonishingly great and various. In the struggle they resorted to the powers of genius, to arms and violence, to promises, to flatteries, to disputations, and to wiles and fallacies; but for the most part with little success. In the first place, in

overcome. To canonization, and to the reading of the bull in Cœna Domini, he was no friend. He actually canonized no one; and on Maunday Thursdays, on which this bull was to be read, he always gave out that he was sick. His Life was written by *Philip Bonamici*, the papal secretary of the Latin Briefs, with design probably, to favour his canonization, in which business he was the Postulator; and it was entitled Commentar. de vita et rebus gestis venerab. servi Dei, Innocentii XI. Pont. Max., Rome, 1776, 8vo. —*Schl.*]

(6) [*Alexander* VIII. restored nepotism, condemned the Jesuitical error of philosophical sin, and benefited the Vatican library, by purchasing the library of queen Christina. —*Schl.*]

(7) Cardinal *Henry Noris* says much respecting *Innocent* XII., his election, character and morals, in his Epistles; published in his Works, tome v., p. 362, 365, 370, 373, 380. [His hostility to nepotism and his inflexibility, his strictness and his frugality, were as great as those of *Innocent* XI. His strictness he manifested in particular, by forbidding the clergy to wear wigs, and by requiring the monks to live according to their rules. He was so little disposed to burn heretics, that the Inquisition began to doubt his orthodoxy; and when he wished to protect *Molinos*, they by commissioners put this question to him, What did *Aloysius Pigniatelli* believe?—*Schl.*]

(8) There were published the last year, [A.D. 1752], in French, two biographies of *Clement* XI., the one composed by the celebrated *Lafitau*, bishop of Sisteron in France; Vie de Clement XI., Padua, 1752, 2 vols. 8vo; the other composed by *Reboulet*, chancellor of Avignon; Histoire de Clement XI., Avenione, 1752, 2 vols. 4to. Both, (but especially the latter), are written with elegance: both contain many historical errors; which French historians are commonly not duly careful to avoid: both are not so much histories as panegyrics; yet are such, that discerning readers can easily discover, that though very discreet, Clement from a desire to confirm and exalt the pontifical majesty, did many things very imprudently, and by his own fault brought much vexation on himself.

order to demonstrate the justice of that war which they had long been preparing to carry on by means of the house of Austria against the followers of the purer faith, they in part suffered, and in part caused, the peace settled with the Protestants by *Charles* V. to be assailed by *Casper Sciop-pius*, a perfidious but learned man, by the Jesuits, *Adam Tanner*, *Anthony Possevin*, *Balthazar Hager*, *Thomas Hederick*, and *Lawrence Forer*, the jurists of Dillingen and others. For they wished to have it believed, that this treaty of peace was unjust, that it had no legitimate force, and that it was violated and rendered null by the Protestants themselves, because they had either corrupted or forsaken the Augsburg Confession.(9) This malicious charge was repelled, privately by many Lutheran divines, and publicly in 1628 and 1631, by order of *John George*, elector of Saxony, in two volumes accurately drawn up by *Matthias Hoe;* which were called the *Lutherans' defence of the apple of their eye* (*Defensio pupillæ Lutheranæ*), to indicate the importance of the subject. The assailants however, did not retreat, but continued to dress up their bad cause, in numerous books written for the most part in an uncouth and sarcastic style. And on the other hand, many of the Lutherans exposed their sophisms and invectives.

§ 3. The religious war, which the pontiffs had for a long time been projecting to be carried on by the Austrians and Spaniards, commenced near the beginning of the century, in the Austrian territories ; where those citizens who had renounced the Romish religion, were oppressed in numberless ways with impunity by their adversaries, and were divested of all their rights.(10) Most of them had neither resolution nor ability to defend their cause, though guarantied by the most solemn treaties and laws. The Bohemians alone, when they perceived it to be the fixed purpose of the adherents of the pope, by gradual encroachment, to deprive them of all liberty of worshipping God according to the dictates of their consciences, though purchased with immense expense of blood by their fathers, and but recently confirmed to them by royal charter; resolved to resist the enemies of their souls, with force and arms. Therefore having entered into a league, they ventured courageously to avenge the wrongs done to them and to their religion. And that they sometimes went farther than either discretion or the precepts of that religion which they defended would justify, no one will deny. This boldness terrified their adversaries, but it did not entirely dismay them. The Bohemians therefore, in order to pluck up the very roots of the evil, when the emperor Matthias died in 1619, thought it their duty to elect for their sovereign, one who was not a Roman Catholic. This they supposed they had a right to do, by the ancient privileges of the nation, which had been accustomed to elect their sovereigns by a free suffrage, and not to receive them by any natural or hereditary right. The consequence was, that *Frederic* V. the electoral prince Palatine, who

(9) Respecting these writings, see, besides others, *Christ. Aug. Salig's* Historie der Augsb Confession, vol. i, b iv., ch. iii., p. 768, &c. [See also *Schlegel's* notes to this paragraph.—*Tr.*]

(10) What occurred in Austria itself, is laboriously narrated by *Bern. Raupach*, in his Austria Evangelica, written in German. The sufferings of the friends of a purer faith, in Stiria, Moravia, and Carinthia, and the arts by which they were utterly suppressed, the same diligent and pious writer intended to have described from published and unpublished documents; but death prevented him. [Something on the subject, as far down as the year 1564, to which date *Raupach* had arrived when death overtook him, *Dr. Winkler* has left us, in his Anecdota Histor. Eccles., pt. viii., p. 233, &c.—*Schl.*]

professed the Reformed religion, was chosen and solemnly crowned, this very year at Prague.(11)

§ 4. But this step, from which the Bohemians anticipated security to their cause, brought ruin upon their new king; and upon themselves various calamities, including that which they most dreaded, the loss of a religion purged of Romish corruptions. *Frederic*, being vanquished by the imperial forces at Prague in the year 1620, lost not only the kingdom he had occupied, but also his hereditary dominions; and now an exile, he had to give up his very flourishing territories together with his treasures, to be depopulated and plundered by the Bavarians. Many of the Bohemians were punished with imprisonment, exile, confiscation of their property, and death: and the whole nation from that time onward, was compelled to follow the religion of the conqueror, and to obey the decrees of the Roman pontiff. The Austrians would have obtained a much less easy victory, or would have at least been obliged to give better terms to the Bohemians, if they had not been aided and assisted by *John George* I. the elector of Saxony; who was influenced both by his hatred of the Reformed religion, and by other motives of a political nature.(12) This overthrow of the prince Palatine, was the commencement of the thirty years' war, which was so disastrous to Germany. For some of the German princes entering into a league with the

(11) Here, in addition to the writers of the ecclesiastical history of this century, *Andrew Carolus*, and *Jo. Wolfg. Jægerus*, see *Burch. Gotth. Struve's* Syntagma Histor. German., p. 1487, 1510, 1523, 1538, &c., and the authors he cites. Add the accurate *Mich. le Vassor's* Histoire de Louis XIII., tome iii., p. 223, &c.

(12) Here may be consulted, the Commentarii de bello Bohemico Germanico ab anno Chr. 1617, ad ann. Chr. 1630, 4to. *Le Vassor's* Histoire de Louis XIII., tome iii., p. 444, &c. Compare also, on many points in these affairs, *Abraham Scultetus'* Narratio Apologetica de curriculo vitæ suæ, p. 86, &c. It is a matter of notoriety, that the Roman Catholics, and particularly the Jesuit *Martin Becan*, induced *Matthias Hoe*, who was an Austrian by birth and chaplain to the elector of Saxony, to make it appear to his master, that the cause of the Palatinate, as being that of the *Reformed* religion, was both unrighteous and injurious to the *Lutheran* religion; and to persuade him to espouse the cause of Austria. See the Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1747, p. 858. [This *Scultetus* was the known court preacher to the unfortunate king of Bohemia; and he is said to have contributed much to his resolving to accept the Bohemian crown. Yet this last fact *Scultetus* denied; though he admitted that he subsequently commended the king for having taken that resolution, and that in one of his sermons he exhorted him to manly courage. *Matthias Hoe* of Hoeneg, of noble Austrian birth, burned with the most terrible religious hatred against the Reformed, and actually abhorred them more than he did the Catholics. To be convinced of this, we need only to read his Manifest Proofs that the Calvinists harmonize with the Arians and the Turks; or his Thoughts respecting the Heilbron League of the Protestant states with Sweden; which last piece is in the Unschuldige Nachrichten, vol. xxxiv., p. 570–581. These traits in his character were known; and perhaps also, the susceptibility of his heart in respect to gold. And hence the Jesuitical emissaries, and particularly *Becan*, were able, (by their unassuming and flattering letters, in which they represented the misfortune it would be, to have the Bohemians fall under the dominion of a Reformed prince), to give such a direction to his mind that he exerted himself against the Reformed, and hindered his master from entering into a league with them. His master was attached to the Evangelical Lutheran faith, was very conscientious, and believed simply whatever his confessor said; *by whom* (as it is expressed in the above cited *Thoughts*, &c.) *he inquired of the Lord.* The Austrian gold, at the same time, may also have had considerable influence on the court preacher's eloquence. At least it is openly stated, that the court preacher afterwards received 10,000 dollars from the imperial court, to divest the elector of those scruples of conscience, which might cause him [to oppose] the peace of Prague so injurious to the common cause. See *Puffendorf*, Rerum Suecicar. lib. vii., p. 193.—*Schl.*]

king of Denmark, took up arms against the emperor in support of the prince Palatine; who, they maintained, was unjustly deprived of his hereditary dominions. For they contended that this prince, by invading Bohemia, had not injured the German *emperor* but only the *house of Austria;* and that the emperor had no right to avenge the wrongs of that *house*, by inflicting the penalties decreed against princes that should rebel against the Roman empire. But this war was not attended with success.(13)

§ 5. The papists therefore, being elated with the success of the emperor, were confident that the period most earnestly longed for had now arrived, when they could either destroy the whole mass of heretics, or bring them again under subjection to the church. The emperor, giving way too much to this impression, fearlessly caried his arms through a great part of Germany; and he not only suffered his generals to harass with impunity those princes and states which manifested less docility than was agreeable to the Romish court, but also showed by no doubtful indications, that the destruction of all Germanic liberty, civil and religious, was determined upon. And the fidelity of the elector of Saxony to the emperor, which he had abundantly evinced by his conduct towards the elector Palatine, and the disunion among the princes of Germany, encouraged the belief that the apparent obstructions to the accomplishment of this great object, might be overcome with but moderate efforts. Hence in the year 1629, the emperor *Ferdinand* II. to give some colour of justice to this religious war, issued that terrible decree called from its object, the *Restitution Edict;* by which the *Protestants* were commanded to deliver up and restore to the Romish church, all ecclesiastical property which had fallen into their hands since the religious peace established in the preceding century.(14) The Jesuits especially are said to have procured from the emperor this decree: and it is indeed ascertained, that this sect had purposed to claim a great part of the property demanded, as due to them in reward of their great services to the cause of religion; and hence arose a violent contest between them and the ancient possessors of that property.(15) The soldiers forthwith gave weight and authority to the imperial mandate, wherever they had power; for whatever the Romish priests and monks claimed as theirs,—and they set up false claims to many things which by no right belonged to them,—the soldiers without any investigation being had, wrested at once from the possessors, often with intolerable ferocity; nor did they hesitate to treat innocent persons with various and most exquisite cruelty.

§ 6. Unhappy Germany amid these commotions was in trepidation; nor did she see among her sons, any one sufficiently powerful to resist the enemy now rushing upon her on every side; for the councils of her princes were exceedingly distracted, partly by religious considerations, partly by eagerness for personal aggrandizement, and partly by fear. But very opportunely *Gustavus Adolphus*, king of Sweden, the great hero of his

(13) [The principal historians of this war, are *Khevenhüller*, Annales Ferdinandi: Von *Chemnitz*, Swedish War: *Puffendorf*, de rebus Suecicis: and the Histories of the thirty years' war, by *Bougeant*, *Krause*, *Schuller*, &c.—See *Henke's* Kirchengesch., vol. iii., p. 321, note.—*Tr.*]

(14) This subject will be found illustrated, by the authors mentioned in *Struve's* Syntagma Histor. German., p. 1553, &c., and by the others mentioned above. [See note (7), p. 66, above.—*Tr.*]

(15) See *Christ. Aug. Salig's* Historie der Augsb. Confession, vol. i., book iv., ch. iii., § 25, p. 810, &c.

age, whom even envy could celebrate after his death, came forward and opposed himself to the Austrian forces. At the instigation especially of the French, who were jealous of the growing power of Austria, he landed in Germany in 1629, with a few forces; and his victories in a short time destroyed in a great measure, the very confident expectations of soon triumphing over our religion, indulged by the emperor and the pope. But their extinguished hopes seemed to revive again in 1632, when this great assertor of Germanic liberty fell victorious in the battle of Lutzen.(16) Time, however, in some measure repaired this immense loss: and the war was protracted to the great misfortune of Germany, amid various vicissitudes, through many years; until the exhausted resources of the parties in it, and the purpose of *Christina* the daughter of *Gustavus* and queen of Sweden, who desired a peace, put an end to these evils and sufferings.

§ 7. After a violent conflict of thirty years, the celebrated peace called the peace of *Westphalia*, because it was concluded at Munster and Osnaburg cities of Westphalia, in the year 1648, gave repose to exhausted Europe. It did not indeed procure for the *Protestants* all the advantages and privileges which they wished for, because the emperor would not be induced by any consideration, to reinstate perfectly the Bohemians and the Austrians in their former privileges, nor restore the Upper Palatinate to its former sovereign; not to mention other difficulties of less moment, which it was necessary to leave untouched: yet the peace procured much greater advantages to the adversaries of the Romish see, than its patrons could well brook; and it established firmly the great interests of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. In the first place, the peace of Augsburg which the Lutherans obtained of *Charles* V. in the preceding century, was placed beyond the reach of all machinations and stratagems; and moreover the edict, which required them to restore the ecclesiastical property of which they had obtained possession since that peace, was annulled; and it was determined, that each party should for ever possess all that was in its hands at the commencement of the year 1624. The advantages acquired by each of the Protestant princes, (and to many of them they were not inconsiderable), it would detain us too long to enumerate.(17) The Roman pontiff in the mean time clamoured loudly, and left no means untried to interrupt the pacification: but neither the emperor nor any one who favoured his cause, was daring enough to venture again upon that perfidious sea on which they had with difficulty escaped shipwreck. The compact was therefore signed without delay; and all the stipulations made

(16) Memoires de la Reine Christine, tom. i., p. 7–20, where much is said of *Gustavus*, his achievements, and his death. The author of this book also illustrates in various respects the history of the peace.

(17) Whoever wishes for circumstantial information on this whole subject, will find abundant satisfaction, in the Acta pacis Westphalicæ et executionis ejus Norimbergensis; an immortal work of immense labour, compiled by *Jo. Godfr. von Meyern*. As a shorter history, instead of all others may be consulted, the work of *Adam Adami*, bishop of Hierapolis, entitled: Relatio Historica de pacificatione Osnabrugo-Monasteriensi; which the illustrious author republished, improved and rendered more accurate than before, Leips., 1737, 4to. Very elegant also, and composed for the most part from the documents of the French envoys, is the very eloquent Jesuit *Bougeant's* Histoire de la paix de Westphalie, Paris, 1746, 6 volumes 8vo. Nor is this Jesuit's history only neat and beautiful; it is likewise in general true and impartial.

in Westphalia, were ratified and executed at Nuremberg in the year 1650.(18)

§ 8. After this period, the Roman pontiffs and their confederates did not venture to attack the professors of the reformed religion by public war; for they found no opportunity to attempt so perilous a measure, with any good prospects. But wherever it could be done without fear of the consequences, they exerted themselves to the utmost, to abridge the Protestants very much of their rights, advantages, and privileges, though confirmed by oaths and the most sacred enactments. In Hungary for instance, the Protestant citizens both Lutheran and Reformed, were tormented with innumerable vexations for ten years together, from 1671 to 1681.(19) Of the lesser evils, which they suffered both before and after this storm, from men of various classes but especially from the Jesuits, there was neither measure nor end. In Poland, all that dissented from the Roman pontiff, experienced nearly throughout the century, to their very great sorrow and distress, that no compact limiting the power of the [Catholic] church was accounted sacred and inviolable at Rome. For they were deprived of their schools, and of very many of their churches; dispossessed of their property, by various artifices; and often visited, though innocent, with the severest punishments.(20) The posterity of the Waldenses living enclosed in the valleys of Piedmont, were sometimes exposed to the most exquisite sufferings on account of their perseverance in maintaining the religion of their fathers; and especially in the years 1632, 1655, and 1685, when the Savoyards cruelly attacked that unhappy people with fire and sword.(21) The infractions of the treaty of Westphalia and of the Germanic liberties

(18) *Innocent* X. assailed this peace in a warm epistle or *bull*, A.D. 1651. On this epistle there is extant a long and learned commentary of *Jo. Hornbeck* entitled: Examen Bullæ Papalis, qua P. Innocentius X. abrogare nititur pacem Germaniæ, Utrecht, 1652, 4to. Perhaps the pontiff's epistle would have found the emperor and his associates ready to listen to it, if it had been backed by gold to give it weight.

(19) See the Historia diplomatica de statu religionis Evangelicæ in Hungaria, p. 69, &c. *Paul Debrezenus*, Historia ecclesiæ Reformatæ in Hungaria, lib. ii., p. 447, &c. *Schelhorn*, in the Museum Helveticum, tom. viii., p. 46–90. [After some previous events which occurred in the year 1670, a conspiracy of some Hungarian nobles against the emperor in 1671, gave the Catholics a favourable opportunity to gratify their thirst for persecution. The noblemen were put to death, as we learn from civil history; but at the same time, for three successive years nearly all the evangelical churches were taken from them by force, and the Lutheran and Reformed ministers and schoolmasters, as participators in the conspiracy and insurrection, were summoned a part of them to Tirnau and others to Presburg. When they appeared, a paper was presented to them to sign, which was very injurious to their ecclesiastical rights. And as they refused to sign it, they were thrown into noisome prisons, where they fared hard enough. From these in 1675, many of them were condemned to the galleys, and were sent to Naples; where however, the intercession of the Dutch admiral *De Ruyter*, procured them freedom. The other prisoners, at the intercession of the republic of Holland, were also set at liberty.—*Schl.*]

(20) See *Adrian Regenvolscius*, Historia Eccles. Slavoniæ, lib. ii, cap. xv., p. 216, 235, 253. What was undertaken against the Polish *dissidents*, (as they were called), after the times of *Regenvolscius*, [after A.D. 1652], may be learned from various writings, published in our times. [See *Jo. Erskine's* Sketches of Church Hist., vol. ii., p. 147, &c. —*Tr.*]

(21) See *Peter Gilles'* Histoire Ecclesiastique des Eglises Vaudoises, cap. xlviii., &c, p. 339, Geneva, 1656, 4to, [also *Jo. Leger's* Histoire des Eglises Vaudoises, pt. ii., cap. 6–20, and *P. Boyer's* Abregé de l'histoire des Vaudois, cap. x–xxvi., p. 64–235. of the English translation, Lond., 1693. The Dukes of Savoy and the kings of France made open war upon these unfortunate Protestants; and actually expelled them the country in 1686. Three years after, most of them returned; but whole congregations

secured by that treaty, arising from this preposterous zeal for the welfare and extension of the Romish church, were so many and so great in many parts of Germany, as to supply matter enough for large volumes.(22) And so long as it shall remain the established belief at Rome, that God has given to the Romish church and to its head, dominion over the whole Christian world, it can never be expected that those can live in security and safety, who renounce subjection to it. For they will always be looked upon as rebellious citizens, whom their legitimate sovereign has a right to punish according to his pleasure.

§ 9. The faithful servants of the Roman pontiff, at length succeeded in this century, in completely purging both Spain and France of the last remains of heresy. In Spain, the descendants of the Moors or Saracens, who once held the sovereignty over a considerable part of that country, had long lived intermingled with the other citizens, and were considerably numerous. They were indeed Christians, at least in profession and outward behaviour; and industrious, useful to the country, and injurious to no one; but they were not a little suspected of a secret inclination towards Mohammedism, the religion of their fathers. The clergy therefore did not cease to importune the king, till he had delivered the country from this pest, and expelled from his territories the whole multitude of Saracens, whose numbers were immense. By this measure, the Spanish commonwealth indeed suffered a great loss, the sad effects of which are felt to the present time: but the church, which is far more important and excellent than the civil state, deemed herself so much the more benefited by it.(23) The *Reformed* in France, commonly called *Huguenots*, having been long borne down by various oppressions and wellnigh destroyed, sometimes by crafty and concealed plots and at other times by open and violent onsets, were at last most cruelly compelled, either secretly to flee their country, or to embrace most reluctantly and against their consciences, the Romish religion. This long persecution, than which a greater or more cruel has not occurred in modern times, will more suitably be explained in the history of the *Reformed* church.

§ 10. All the efforts, devices and plans, which the boldest and most versatile geniuses could originate, were employed to bring Great Britain and Ireland again under the Romish yoke. But all these attempts failed. In the beginning of the century, some nefarious miscreants burning with hatred of what they regarded as a new and false religion, and prompted by the counsel of three Jesuits of whom *Henry Garnet* was the chief, determined to destroy at a stroke, king *James* I. with his son, and the whole British parliament, by means of gunpowder, which they had concealed under the house where the parliament usually met. For they had no doubts, if these could be destroyed, means would occur for reinstating the old religion and giving it its former ascendency. The English call this horrid conspiracy, the *gunpowder plot*. But divine Providence caused it to be wonderfully discovered and frustrated, when it was ripe for execution.(24)

remained permanently in foreign lands, and particularly in the territory of Würtemberg. —*Tr.*]

(22) The Histories of religious grievances, by the learned *Burch. Gotth. Struve* and *Christ. Godfr. Hoffmann*, composed in German, are in every body's hands.

(23) *Michael Geddes*, History of the expulsion of the Moriscoes out of Spain; in his Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. i., p. 59, &c.

(24) *Rapin Thoyras*, Histoire d'Angleterre, livr. xviii., tom. vii., p. 40, &c. *John Henry Heidegger*, Historia Papatus, period. vii., p. 211, 291, &c. [*Hume's* Hist.

More gentle and cautious was the procedure, during the reign of *Charles* I. the son of *James*. For the king being of a mild and effeminate character, and apparently not far removed from Romish sentiments, having also a French wife who was devoted to the Romish worship, and being guided chiefly by the counsels of *William Laud* archbishop of Canterbury, an honest man undoubtedly and not unlearned, but immoderately attached to what was ancient in ecclesiastical matters; it seemed probable that England might become reconciled with the Roman pontiff more easily by caresses and promises, than by commotions and bloodshed.(25) But this expectation was frustrated by that lamentable civil war, in which *Laud* as well as *Charles* were beheaded, and *Oliver Cromwell*, a man of energy, foresight, and cunning, and one who dreaded even the shadow of the Romish religion, was placed at the head of the government, with the title of *Protector* of the commonwealth of England. The expectation was revived, when *Charles* II. was raised to the throne of his father, to the immoderate joy of the people: and it revived with increased confidence and satisfaction. For the king himself, as appears now from very abundant testimony,(26) had already been secretly initiated in the Romish worship during his exile; and his only brother, *James* II. the heir to the crown, had openly apostatized from the religion of the English nation, to that of Rome. But *Charles* was prevented from doing any thing in favour of popery by his native indolence, extreme fondness for dissipation, and an indifference to all religion, tending to extreme impiety: and *James* by his immoderate eagerness to consult the wishes of the Romanists, and to follow the rash counsels of the Jesuits whom he kept about him, inflicted an incurable wound both upon the Romish religion and upon himself. For being created king, after his brother's death, he in the most open manner, and therefore most injudiciously, supported the languishing cause of popery in England and Ireland; and to do this more effectually, he fearlessly trampled upon those rights and liberties of the nation which were held most sacred and precious. Exasperated by these measures of the king, the people of England, in the year 1688, invited over from Holland, his son-in-law *William* prince of Orange; and *his* valour obliged his father-in-law to flee into France, an exile, and deprived the friends and promoters of the Romish religion, of all hope of recovering England to the Romish church.(27)

§ 11. When the wiser patrons and promoters of the Romish cause perceived, that little success attended violence and war, they concluded, that the reluctant minds of the Protestants must be overcome by milder

of England, ch. xlvi., vol. v., p. 60, &c.—*Tr.*]

(25) See *Urban Cerry's* Etat présent de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 315, &c. *Dan. Neal's* Hist. of the Puritans, vol. iii., p. 194, &c.

(26) *Gilb. Burnet's* History of his own times, vol. i., book iii., p. 603, &c., 606, &c., [and book i., p. 73, 74.—*Tr.*] *Dan. Neal's* Hist. of the Puritans, vol. iv., p. 233, 237 534, [ed. Boston, 1817, vol. iv., ch. iv., p. 255, &c.—*Tr.*] *Rapin Thoyras*, Histoire d'Angleterre, livr. xxiii., vol. ix., p. 160. [*Hume's* Hist. of Eng., ch. lxiii., vol. vi., p. 374, and especially ch. lxvi., vol. vii., p. 3, note; where it is proved, that *Charles* II. entered into a treaty with the king of France, in the close of the year 1669, or beginning of 1670, for the purpose of overthrowing the Protestant religion in England, and establishing popery on its ruins.—*Tr.*]

(27) These events are very accurately described by *Gilbert Burnet* and *Rapin Thoyras*; by the former, in the second volume of the History of his own times, (which has been translated from English into both French and German), and by the latter, in his Histoire d'Angleterre, vol. x. Add *Dan. Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. iv., ch. xi., p. 536, &c. [And *Hume's* History of England, vol. vii., ch. lxx., lxxi.—*Tr.*]

measures and by covert artifices. But all of them were not disposed to adopt precisely the same course. Some resorted to public disputations between distinguished men of the two communities; indulging an expectation, which the numerous vain attempts of the preceding age could not but weaken, that in such colloquies, the more strenuous adversaries of the papal supremacy could either be vanquished, or at least softened. Others thought, that contests should be avoided, and consultations rather, should be held by the dissidents, in order to agree upon a compromise; and therefore, that less weight and importance should be attributed to the points of disagreement, than had before been usual. Lastly, there were others, who believing that the former disputants on the side of the Romish church possessed vigour and spirit enough, but were deficient in *skill*, judged that new attacks should be made: and these of course invented new modes of reasoning against heretics.

§ 12. At the very commencement of the century A.D. 1601, some distinguished Lutheran divines, by authority of *Maximilian* of Bavaria and *Philip Lewis*, elector Palatine, disputed at Ratisbon with three Jesuits of great fame, respecting the *rule of faith and practice* and the *judge of religious controversies;* subjects which embrace nearly the whole controversy between the Protestants and Roman Catholics. In the year 1615, *Wolfgang William*, prince Palatine, who had apostatized to the Romish faith, caused a rencounter at Newburg, between *James Keller* a Jesuit, and *James Hielbronn* a Lutheran. In the year 1645, *Uladislaus* king of Poland, called the more distinguished theologians, papists as well as Lutherans and Reformed, to a meeting at Thorn in Prussia, to deliberate amicably on the means of putting an end to the existing religious controversies; which design of the king, procured for this discussion the name of the *Charitable Conference*. A little after, in 1651, *Ernestus* landgrave of Hesse, in order to give a plausible air to that apostacy to the Romish camp which he had before resolved on, ordered *Valerianus Magnus*, a celebrated Capuchin divine, to hold a discussion, particularly with *Peter Haberkorn* a divine of Giessen, in the castle of Rheinfels. Among the private disputes of this kind the most noted of all, was that of *John Claude* a very learned divine of the French Reformed church, with that superior man of the Catholic church *James Benignus Bossuet*, in the year 1685. All these conferences had one and the same result. Neither party could convince the other; but each exasperated and alienated the other from itself, more than before.(28)

(28) Whoever wishes for a fuller account of these conferences, may consult the writers mentioned by *Casper Sagittarius*, Introduct. in historiam eccles., tom. ii., p. 1569, 1581, 1592, 1598. *Claude* and *Bossuet*, each wrote and published the history of the dispute between them. *Bossuet's* book is entitled: Conférence avec Mr. Claude sur la matiere de l'Eglise, Paris, 1683, 12mo. In answer to this, *Claude* published his: Réponse au livre de Mr. de Meaux intitulé Conference avec Mr. Claude; a la Haye, 1683, 8vo. [The conference at Ratisbon, was between seven Lutheran and three Catholic divines, and occupied 14 sessions, ending Nov. 28. Both parties afterwards published the *Acts* of this conference; which produced farther controversy, each party accusing the other of misrepresentation. See *Schmidt's* Continuation of *Sagittarius'* Introduction, p. 1569, &c.— There was a conference appointed at Durlach in 1612, by order of *Geo. Frederic* margrave of Baden, and *Francis* duke of Lorrain. The latter at the request of the Jesuits, forbid the Protestants to draw *inferences* from scripture, and required them to cite only direct, categorical declarations of the Bible against the Catholics. These terms the Protestant divines refused: and the conference ended. Its *Acts* were published, Strasburg, 1614, 4to.—The confer-

§ 13. The whole art and method of those who attempted a *reconciliation* between the Protestants and the Papists, consisted in efforts to make it appear, that the parties did not disagree so much as they supposed; and that there was not so much need of a discussion [of the points at issue], as of a careful and perspicuous explanation of those doctrines of the Romish community which were offensive to their opposers, in order to remove entirely all controversy, and unite the minds of both in bonds of harmony. But in pursuing this general plan, they varied so much from each other, that it was apparent they needed to come to some agreement among themselves, before there could be ground for listening to the counsels and advice they gave. The principal man among those who exerted their ingenuity in this way, was *Armand Richelieu;* that very powerful French minister of state, who spared neither promises nor threatenings nor arguments and persuasions, in order to bring the French Reformed Christians to unite with the Catholics.(29) The course pursued by this illustrious man, was followed, yet with unequal steps and with less influence, by the German Jesuit *James Masenius,*(30) by *Adolphus Godfr. Volusius* a divine of Mentz,(31) by *Matth. Prætorius* a Prussian,(32) by *Aug. Gibbon von Bur-*

ence at Newburg embraced but two sessions; as *Heilbronn*, by advice of his friends, refused to appear at the third. It related wholly to the correctness of the citations from the fathers, in a book published by *Heilbronn*, entitled *Uncatholic Popery*. *Keller* published his account of the conference, Ingolst., 1615, 4to, and *Heilbronn* his account, Ulm, 1616, 4to.—The conference at Thorn was occasioned by the Reformed preacher at Dantzic, *Barthol. Nigrinus*, who had become a Catholic, and persuaded the king that such a conference would be attended by good consequences. But the result did not answer the expectations from it. The history of the conference and of the subsequent written discussions, is given by *Christ. Hartknoch*, in der Preussich. Kirchenhistorie, vol. iv., ch. vi.—See *Schlegel's* note here.—*Tr.*]

(29) *Rich. Simon*, Lettres Choisies, tome i., p. 31, 32, &c., new edit. *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire, tome i., art. *Amyraut*, note 1, p. 183; art. *Beaulieu*, note C, p. 484; tome ii., art. *Ferry*, note D, p. 1169; tome iii., art. *Millettierc*, p. 1982, and elsewhere. [To *Moses Amyraut*, an eminent French Protestant divine and professor at Saumur, *Richelieu* commissioned a Jesuit named *Andebert*, to offer a negotiation for a union of the Protestants and Calvinists. The Jesuit stated, that for the sake of peace, the king and his minister were willing to give up the invocation of creatures, purgatory, and the merit of good works; that they would limit the power of the pope; and if the court of Rome would consent to it, they would create a patriarch; that the cup should be allowed to the laity; and that some other relaxations might be made. *Amyrault* mentioned the eucharist. The Jesuit said: no change in that was proposed. *Amyrault* said; then nothing can be done. Here the conference of four hours length, terminated. See *Bayle*, l. c.—*Beaulieu*, a Protestant professor of theology at Sedan, was suspected but without grounds, of a willingness to sacrifice some doctrines in order to produce a union. He had only maintained, that many of the disputes of theologians, were about words rather than things. Yet it appears, that marshal *Turenne* sounded *Beaulieu* on the subject of a union. See *Bayle*, l. c.—*Paul Ferri* was an eloquent French Protestant preacher at Mentz. His enemies circulated the false report, that he was one of the Protestant ministers whom cardinal *Richelieu* had persuaded to agree to a union of the Protestant and Catholic churches. See *Bayle*, l. c.—*Theoph. Brachet Sieur de la Millettierre* was a Protestant minister in France, who turned Catholic in 1645, after being silenced for attempts to unite the Protestant and Catholic churches on terms dishonourable to the former. He wrote and published much on the subject. See *Bayle*, l. c.—*Tr.*]

(30) See *Fred. Spanheim's* Stricturæ ad Bossueti expositionem fidei Catholicæ; in his Opp. Theol., tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 1042. [*Marsenius* published some books on the subject of a union; which were answered by the Protestants.—*Tr.*]

(31) He published: Aurora pacis religiosæ divinæ veritati amica; Mayence, 1665, 4to.

(32) In his Tuba pacis; concerning which, see *Peter Bayle's* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, A.D. 1685, p. 1309. [He

go, an Irishman who was a professor at Erfurth,(33) by *Henry Marcellus* a Jesuit,(34) and by some others of less fame. In more recent times, no one has entered upon such an attempt with more foresight and sagacity, than *James Benignus Bossuet*, bishop of Meaux; a man of uncommon genius and extraordinary prudence, whose *Exposition of the Catholic faith*, aims exclusively to show, that a short and easy way of return to the Romish religion, would be open to the Protestants, if they would only judge of its nature and principles not according to the views entertained of it by their teachers, but as it really is.(35) After him, *John Dezius* a Jesuit of Strasburg, undertook to demonstrate the same thing, though with less success, in a book in which he endeavours to prove, that there is no disagreement or but very little, between the council of Trent and the Augsburg Confession; than which, no two systems can be more unlike.(36) All these and some others, undertook upon their own responsibility alone, to remove the difficulties which prevented our ancestors from uniting with the pontiff: but *Christopher de Roxas*, bishop of Thina in Bosnia, came forward clothed with public authority, or at least professing to be so; and in the year 1686 and onward, he visited the principal Protestant courts in Germany, not only holding out the prospect of a new and more free coun-

was a Lutheran minister when he wrote the book; but he soon after became a Catholic. —*Schl.*]

(33) In his Luthero-Calvinismus schismaticus quidem, sed reconciliabilis. [He was an Augustinian Eremite, who after long wandering about, settled in Germany, and died at Erfurth in 1676, as ex-provincial of his order, and professor of theology.—*Schl.*]

(34) The Sapientia pacifica of *Marcellus*, was, by order of the duke of Gotha, confuted by *Jo. Chr. Seldius*.

(35) Of this little book and its fortunes, very much might be said, and not without profit. Among many others, see *Christ. Matth. Pfaff*, Historia litterar. Theologiæ, tom. ii., p. 102. *Jo. le Clerc*, Biblioth. universelle et histor., tome xi., p. 438.—[" It is remarkable, that nine years passed before this book could obtain the pope's approbation. *Clement* X. refused it positively. Nay, several Roman Catholic priests were rigorously treated, and severely persecuted, for preaching the doctrine contained in the Exposition of *Bossuet*, which was, moreover, formally condemned by the university of Louvain, in the year 1685, and declared to be *scandalous* and *pernicious*. The Sorbonne also disavowed the doctrine contained in that book; though by a late edict we learn, that the fathers of that theological seminary have changed their opinion on that head, and thus given a new instance of the *variations* that reign in the Romish church, which boasts so much of its uniformity in doctrinal matters. The artifice that was employed in the composition of this book, and the tricks that were used in the suppression and alteration of the first edition that was given of it, have been detected with great sagacity and evidence by the learned and excellent archbishop *Wake*, in the Introduction to his Exposition of the Doctrines of the Church of England, &c. See also his two Defences of that Exposition, in which the perfidious sophistry of *Bossuet* is unmasked, and refuted in the most satisfactory manner. There was an excellent answer to *Bossuet's* book published by *M. de la Bastide*, one of the most eminent Protestant ministers in France. This answer the French prelate took no notice of, during eight years; at the end of which he published an advertisement, in a new edition of his Exposition, which was designed to remove the objections of *La Bastide*. The latter replied in such a demonstrative and victorious manner, that the learned bishop, notwithstanding all his eloquence and art, was obliged to quit the field of controversy. See a very interesting account of this insidious work of *Bossuet*, and the controversies it occasioned, in the Bibliotheque des Sciences, published at the Hague, vol. xviii., p. 20. This account, which is curious, accurate, ample, and learned, was given partly on occasion of a new edition of the Exposition, printed at Paris in 1761, and accompanied with a Latin translation done by *Fleury*, and partly on occasion of *Burigny's* Life of Bossuet, published the same year, at Paris."—*Macl.*]

(36) The book is entitled: La Réunion des Protestans de Strasburg à l'Eglise Romaine; Strasb., 1689, 8vo. See *Phil. Jac. Spener's* Theological Reflections, (in German), vol. i., p. 95.

cil than that of Trent, but also giving assurance that the pontiff would freely grant to his returning children, the Protestants, whatever privileges and immunities they might demand, if they would only cease to decline the very mild government of the common father of Christians. But it was not difficult for the theologians, nor for the more discerning statesmen also, to discover that this was only a snare; and that the Romish bishops aimed not so much to bring about an honourable and stable peace, as to introduce again the ancient system of slavery.(37)

§ 14. These Romish peacemakers found among the Protestants, especially among the Reformed, some divines whose natural dislike of contention, or whose hope of obtaining fame and making their fortune, induced them to listen to these overtures, and to assert, that the points in contro-

(37) See the collections in *Jo. Wolfg. Jäger's* Historia Eccles., sæcul. xvii., and in *Christ. Eberh. Weismann's* Historia Eccles., sæcul, xvii., p. 735. There are also extant other proposals for union, made known at the German courts in the year 1660, by the elector of Mayence, by order and authority (as it is said) of the Roman pontiff: and which *Jo. Dan. Gruber* has published, in the Commercium Epistolicum Leibnitianum, tom. i., p. 411–415: add, p. 426, &c.—[*Christopher Rojas*, (*Roxas*, *Rohas*, or *Rorhas*) *de Spinola*, was a native Spaniard, and first came to Vienna in 1666, as confessor to the Infanta *Margaretha Theresa*, the first wife of the emperor *Leopold*. In the year 1668, he was made bishop of Tina in Croatia; and in 1685, bishop of Neustadt Wienerisch, in Lower Austria. While bishop of Tina, his bishopric affording him little employment, he travelled about Germany, with the approbation of pope *Innocent* XI., as a negotiator with the Protestants for their return to the church of Rome. The emperor *Leopold* also employed him in civil negotiations; and in 1691, empowered him to negotiate with his Protestant subjects in Hungary and Transylvania, a reconciliation with Rome. The terms he offered the Protestants were, (I.) The suspension of the decrees of Trent; and the assembling a new council, in which the Protestants and Catholics should each have an equal number of voters, and the decisions of Trent undergo a new and impartial investigation. (II.) The acquittal of the Protestants from the charge of heresy, provided they would cease to call the pope *Antichrist*. (III.) Communion in both kinds; marriage of priests; continuance in their possession of church property; abolition of auricular confession; and public worship in the vernacular tongue. In respect to the authority of the pope, and traditions, he did not express himself clearly.—The archbishop of Mayence, who had been active in promoting the peace of Westphalia, after sending an envoy to Rome, and consulting the electors of Treves and Cologne, held several meetings with the German Catholics who were solicitous for the peace of the country, at Mayence, Treves, Darmstadt, Rome, and elsewhere; and then made the following proposals to the Protestants at Ratisbon. 1. That twelve Lutheran and twelve Catholic divines should meet together, swear to act honestly and in good faith, without fraud or subterfuge, as they should answer it to God. 2. That they should examine the religious disputes, and decide them according to the Bible only. 3. That to enable them to agree, they should first make a new translation of the Bible. 4. That whatever a majority of them agreed to, should be considered as valid articles of faith. 5. That both the decrees of the council of Trent and the Augsburg Confession, should be examined, article by article, and judged of according to the Scriptures. As preliminary articles, it was proposed to yield: 1. Worship in the German language. 2. Marriage of bishops and the secular clergy, but not of monks and nuns. 3. The abolition of auricular confession in Germany and the other Protestant countries; but not in Spain and Italy, where for certain reasons it was esteemed necessary. 4. Every one to be at liberty, to pray to the saints or not. 5. Purgatory no longer to be an article of faith. 6. Communion in both kinds, to be allowed. 7. The pope no longer to be regarded as universal judge, but only as the first priest and bishop of the church. Difficult questions of conscience may be laid before him; but none shall be compelled to follow his decisions. 8. Christians to be hereafter divided into two classes, the Ancient Catholics, and the Reformed Catholics; who should regard each other as brethren. Cardinals to be taken from both classes, and an equal number from each.—To these propositions, the Lutheran courts raised many objections; and the whole project was soon abandoned. See *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. vii., p. 98, &c., and *Schlegel's* note here.—*Tr.*]

versy between the two communities were not of such magnitude, as to forbid all union. Among the French Reformed, *Lewis le Blanc*, a man otherwise possessed of discernment, together with his disciples, fell under a suspicion of this fault.(38) It is more certain, that *Theophilus Brachet Milletierre*, and *Huisseaux* a divine of Saumur, *Tanaquil Faber* and some others, were chargeable with this conduct.(39) Among the English, *William Forbes* especially, showed himself ready to compromise a great part of the controversies which separate us from the Romanists.(40) Among the Dutch, no man of information can well be ignorant, how much *Hugo Grotius* was disposed to unite all sects of Christians together, and especially to excuse and to give favourable views of the papists.(41) But these and the others, (whom we omit to mention), obtained only this reward for their well-intended labours, that they offended both parties, and drew upon themselves a great weight of odium. To this class of divines who burned with a preposterous zeal for union with the Romanists, many reckon *George Calixtus*, a very learned professor in the university of Helmstadt; that is, the very man, than whom no one perhaps in this age, more learnedly and lucidly demonstrated the errors and defects of the papal church; and no one more uniformly affirmed that the decrees and the denunciations of the council of Trent, destroyed all hope of healing the division. The reason why he was thought to lean towards this class, was, that he used softer language than was customary respecting some controversies; and that he believed, the first principles of the Christian religion were not absolutely subverted by the Romanists, but only loaded and deformed by a great multitude of intolerable opinions.

§ 15. This band of *pacificators*, which was illy marshalled and weak from its own discords, was easily put to flight by a moderate effort: but stronger forces were necessary, to withstand those among the papists who devised new modes of warfare. These have usually been called *Methodists:* and they were chiefly of that ingenious nation the French, whom perpetual conflicts with the very learned *Huguenots* (as the Protestants of France are called) had rendered extremely fond of disputation, and also expert in it for that age. They may very suitably be divided into two classes. The first class imposed hard and unreasonable laws of argumen-

(38) See *Bayle's* Dictionnaire, tome i., p. 484, &c. [art. *Beaulieu*. See also note (29) above. His whole name was *Louis le Blanc Sieur de Beaulieu.—Tr.*]

(39) Concerning *Milletierre*, see *Bayle*, Dictionnaire, tome iii., p. 1982, [and note (29) above.] Concerning *Huisseaux* and his pacific propositions, see *Rich. Simon*, Lettres Choisies, tome iii., p. 14, and *Jac. Aymon*, Synodes Nationaux de Eglises Reformées en France, tome ii, p. 765. [*Jo. Quick's* Synodicon in Gallia Reformata, vol. ii., p. 544, &c.—*Tr.*] On *Faber's* attempt, see *Dan. Geo. Morhoff*, Polyhistor., tome i., p. 295.

(40) His considerationes modestæ et pacificæ controversiarum de justificatione, purgatorio, &c., were published, Lond., 1658, 8vo, and in Germany, with corrections by *Jo. Fabricius*, a divine of Helmstadt. He is highly extolled by *Jo. Ern. Grabe*, in his notes to *Bull's* Harmonia Apostolica, p. 19. Nor were his probity and very exemplary life, unworthy of praise. Yet the wiser among the English, cannot but admit that he favoured the Romish party too much. See *Gilbert Burnet's* History of his own times, vol. i., p. 22. He was of course much commended by the papists. See *Rich. Simon's* Lettres Choises, tome iii., lettr. xviii., p. 119. He was undoubtedly one of those who did most to persuade the English, (whether right or wrong), that king *Charles* I. and *William Laud* had designs of again restoring the Romish religion in England.

(41) Here may be consulted with advantage, though he is partial to *Grotius*, the author of the book: Grotii manes ab iniquis obtrectatoribus vindicati, tom ii., p. 542, 826, &c.

tation upon the Protestants; and resembled those generals who concentrate their troops in fortresses, and surround themselves with ramparts, to enable them more easily to resist the assaults of their foes. Of this class was *Francis Veronius*, a Jesuit; who supposed the enemies of the Romish religion ought to prove their doctrines by explicit declarations of the holy scriptures, and therefore preposterously forbid their resorting to any *inferences*, necessary consequences, or argumentation;(42) *Barthold Nihusius*, an apostate;(43) the brothers named *Walenburg* and others, who deeming it easier to defend their cause against attacks than to demonstrate its justice, threw the whole burden of proof on their adversaries, assuming the ground of mere respondents and defendants; *Armand Richelieu*, who recommended neglecting the various objections and complaints of their adversaries, reducing the whole controversy to the single article of the *church*, and placing the divine majesty and authority of *that* beyond all cavils by means of conclusive arguments; and some others.(44) The other class preferred the plan of those generals, who to avoid a protracted war, resolve to stake all upon the issue of a general battle, instead of wasting time in sieges and a series of skirmishes; that is, they thought best not to

(42) *Jo. Musæus*, de usu principiorum rationis in controversiis Theologicis, lib. i., cap. iv., p. 22. *Geo. Calixtus*, Digressio de arte nova, p. 125, &c. *Rich. Simon*, Lettres Choisies, tome i., p. 276. [The famous controversial preacher *Veron*, who under the protection of the French court, travelled about challenging the Huguenots to public disputation and conference, from the year 1622 onward, composed a book with the Thrasonic title: Methodus nova, facilis et solida, hæresin ex fundamento destruendi, et refutandi confessionem Gallicam, Augustanam, Saxonicam, libros denique omnes Theologorum Protestantium, &c.—*Schl.*]

(43) *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire, tom. iii., p. 2096, &c. [art. *Nihusius*]. This vain and half-learned man was formally confuted by *Geo. Calixtus*, in his Digressio de arte nova contra Nihusium; a book very well worth reading; Helmst., 1634, 4to. [*Nihusius* was a Lutheran divine, educated under *Calixtus* at Helmstadt. But he turned Catholic about the year 1614; after which he became an abbot and a bishop, and wrote numerous letters and tracts in support of popery. He died in 1657. His principal work was entitled: Ars nova dicto sacræ Scripturæ unico lucrandi e Pontificiis plurimos in partes Lutheranorum, detecta nonnihil et suggesta Theologis Helmstetentibus, Georgio Calixto præsertim et Conrado Horneio. *Nihusius* assumed, that the church of Rome was an ancient church, and in possession of a system of doctrines which she had held unmolested for ages; of course, she was not to be ousted of her possession by any new claimant, unless that claimant could make good his title. In this way, he threw all the burden of proof on the Protestants, or upon the innovators on the established religion. At the same time, he forbid their reasoning from Scripture by way of inference; and required them to bring direct and positive proofs. Reasonings he said, were human; positive declarations of the Bible were divine. Moreover in reasoning from the Bible, men differed so widely, that there was no knowing what to believe, unless we admitted and confided in an infallible interpreter, namely the pope. When it was objected, that the popes had for centuries been such dissolute and base characters, that it could not be supposed they were the mouth of God to men; he replied, that the same might be said of some of the writers of the Bible, *David* for instance, &c. See *Bayle*, loc. cit.—*Tr.*]

(44) For a somewhat fuller account of these matters, see *Frederic Spanheim*, Stricturæ ad expositionem fidei Bossueti, in his Opp., tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 1037. *Jo. Henr. Heidegger*, Historia Papatus, period vii., § ccxviii., p. 316. *Jo. Geo. Walch*, Introduction to Religious Controversies; written in German; vol. ii., p. 191, &c. *Christ. Eberh. Weismann*, Historia Eccles., sæcul. xvii., p. 726, and various others. [*Peter* and *Adrian* von *Walenburg* were two brothers, born at Rotterdam, who abandoned their country and their religion, and lived at Cologne. The first was a titular bishop in Mysia, and suffragan to Cologne; the other was the titular bishop of Adrianople, and suffragan to Mayence. Their works, consisting chiefly of controversial pieces against the Protestants, were printed together, under the title of: Fratrum Walenburgicorum opera, 1670, 2 vols. fol.—*Schl.*]

weigh one point after another, and answer in detail all the arguments of opposers, but to overwhelm the Protestants at once, by certain great principles or general arguments involving the whole subject, or by what are technically called *prœjudicia*. The glory if not of inventing, yet of perfecting this method and of displaying it with great eloquence, is enjoyed by *Peter Nicole* a Jansenist, who was neither a bad man nor an obtuse reasoner.(45) After him, many others supposed there was so much power in this method, that they believed a single argument of this kind, if wisely and properly managed, was sufficient to overthrow the whole cause of the Protestants. Hence, some opposed the Protestants with the single principle of *prescription;* others supposed our case would be desperate, if it could be made to appear, that the principal reformers were vicious men and destitute of virtue; many believed, they should divest their antagonists of all means of defence, on the ground that religious separation or *schism* is the greatest of all evils, if they made it appear, that the fathers of the reformed churches were the authors of so great a calamity.(46) Pre-eminent among these, for the felicity of his genius and the copiousness of his eloquence, but not for his discernment, was *James Benignus Bossuet;* who endeavoured to demonstrate from the disagreements among the Protestant doctors, and from the frequent changes their church and doctrines had undergone, that the church established by *Luther* was not a true church; and from the perpetual uniformity of the Romish church, that it was the true church and of divine origin.(47) This appears very surprising, as coming from a learned man, who could not be ignorant that the pontiffs are very subservient to times and places and to the opinions of men; and still more as coming from a Frenchman, whose fellow-citizens contend with so much zeal, that modern Rome differs as much from ancient and primitive Rome as lead does from gold.

§ 16. So many and various efforts of the patrons of the Romish church, occasioned indeed the Protestant doctors not a little labour, but produced very slender effects. Some of the princes and a few learned men, were induced to embrace again the Romish religion which their fathers had renounced; but no one nation or province, could be persuaded to follow their example. Of the highest order of persons, *Christina* queen of Sweden, a lady of great spirit and genius, but precipitate, and one who preferred her

(45) He is generally supposed to be the author of that book, confuted by vast numbers, entitled, Préjugez legitimes contre les Calvinistes, Paris, 1671, 8vo, and afterwards reprinted several times.—[" This *method* certainly was not the invention of *Nicolle*, for it seems to differ little, if at all from the method of cardinal *Richelieu*. We may observe farther, that *Richelieu* seems rather to belong to the second class of Methodists than to the first, where *Dr. Mosheim* has placed him."—*Macl.*]

(46) *Fred. Spanheim*, Diss. de Præscriptione in rebus fidei adversus novos Methodistas; in his Opp., tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 1079.

(47) His Histoire des variations des Eglises Protestantes, Paris, 1688, 8vo, is very generally known. To this day, the papists confide in it, and place it among their strongest bulwarks. And they may continue to exult in this their great champion and defender, if they choose; but if they are not beside themselves, and wish to preserve the head of their church safe, they must be exceedingly desirous that *Bossuet's* great principle, that *whatever church frequently modifies and changes its doctrines has not the holy Spirit*, may never be believed true, by any one who is acquainted with the course of events at Rome. [Against *Bossuet*, *James Basnage* wrote his famous Histoire des Eglises reformées; Rotterdam, 1690, 2 vols. 8vo. And as *Bossuet* replied to this, in his Defense de l'Histoire des variations; *Basnage* composed his great work: Histoire de l'Eglise depuis J. C. jusque à present; Rotterd., 1699, 2 vols. fol.—*Schl.*]

ease, pleasure and liberty, to all other considerations ;(48) *Wolfgang William*, count Palatine of the Rhine ;(49) *Christian William*, marquis of Brandenburg ;(50) *Ernest*, prince of Hesse ;(51) *John Frederic*, duke of Brunswick ;(52) and *Frederic Augustus*, king of Poland,(53) subjected themselves to the Roman pontiff. Of the men of genius and erudition, the illustrious *Jo. Christian* baron of Boisneburg, privy counsellor to the elector of Mayence, and a noted Mæcenas in that age ;(54) *Christ. Ranzovius*, a knight of Holstein ;(55) *Caspar Scioppius* ;(56) *Peter Bertius* ;(57) *Chris-*

(48) Of this queen, and the causes of her defection to the Romish church, there is a very full account in *Arkenholz*, Memoires de la Reine Christine ; which is a very interesting and useful book. [This vain and rash woman, who probably had no fixed religious principles, became weary of the cares of government ; resigned her crown in 1654, and retired to Italy, to enjoy the refined society of that country. As a preparatory step to a comfortable residence at Rome, while on her way thither, she changed her religion.—*Tr.*]

(49) [This prince, at his solemn renunciation of Protestantism in the year 1614, assigned as his reasons, the common arguments used by Catholics to prove the truth of their religion, and the falsehood of the Protestant. But it was believed at the time, and even by Catholic historians, that a principal motive with him was, to secure the favour of the emperor and of the Spanish court, in order to make sure his heirship to the duchy of Julian-Cleves. See *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. iv., p. 370, and *Schlegel's* note here.—*Tr.*]

(50) [At the capture of Magdeburg by the imperial troops in 1630, he was taken prisoner, and carried to Vienna, where his conversion took place. The grounds of it, which he published, were chiefly, that the Protestants had no legitimate priesthood. See *Schlegel's* note here.—*Tr.*]

(51) This very learned and good prince was converted in 1651, by the celebrated Capuchin monk, *Valerius Magnus*. See *Gruber's* Commercium Epistol. Leibnitianum, tom. i., p. 27, 35. Memoires de la Reine Christine, tome i., p. 216. But it is manifest from the writings of *Ernest* himself, that he, as well as *Anth. Ulric* duke of Brunswick, and many others, did not go over to such a Romish church as actually exists, but to a very different one, which has long since ceased to be, and of which his imagination formed an idea.

(52) [He put entire confidence in his favourite preacher, *Henry Julius Blum* ; and when solicited to apostatize, refused, unless the Catholics could first convert *Blum*. The Jesuits then applied themselves to *Blum*, and offered him an income of 2000 dollars annually, if he would turn Catholic. *Blum* consented. A dispute was held between them in presence of the duke.—For a considerable time *Blum* answered all the arguments of the Jesuits triumphantly ; but at length they adduced a new argument, which *Blum* could not withstand, and which, he told the duke, was unanswerable. Of course he now openly yielded to popery ; and the duke followed his example. This was in 1654. *Blum* obtained his pension, and at length was made vice-president of the supreme court of appeals at Prague. See *Schlegel's* note here.—*Tr.*]

(53) [He was the elector of Saxony, and to qualify himself for the throne of Poland, made profession of the Catholic religion in the year 1697. See *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. s. d Reform., vol. vii., p. 74, and *Henke's* Kirchengesch., vol. iv., p. 559.—*Tr.*]

(54) He apostatized to the Romish church in 1653, following the example of *Ernest*, prince of Hesse ; and was indeed a man of great distinction, but rather a man of letters than a sound reasoner or philosopher. See *Gruber's* Commercium Epistol. Leibnitianum, containing *his* and *Conring's* Epistles, tom. i., p. 35, 37, 39, 48, 56, 60, 70, 76, 93, &c.

(55) See *Jo. Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. i., p. 520. [He defended Lutheranism at Helmstadt in 1649. But the next year, at Rome, the splendour of the Jubilee, and the arguments of *Lucas Holstenius* overcame him. See *Henke*, Kirchengesch., vol. iv., p. 300, &c.—*Tr.*]

(56) [He was a German, learned, ardent, restless. He became a papist about A.D. 1600 ; fell out with the Jesuits ; and fought much against the Protestants. See *Bayle*, Dictionnaire, vol. iv., art. *Scioppius*.—*Tr.*]

(57) [*Bertius* was rector of the theological college of Leyden. Being an Arminian, he was censured by the synod of Dort, and afterwards excommunicated. He retired to France, became a Catholic, was a professor at Paris, historiographer to the king, and died in 1629. See *Rees'* Cyclopedia, article *Bertius*.—*Tr.*]

topher Besoldus;(58) *Helfr. Ulr. Hunnius*;(59) *Nich. Stenonius*, a celebrated Danish physician;(60) *Jo. Phil. Pfeiffer*, a professor at Königsberg;(61) *Lucas Holstenius*,(62) with his kinsman, *Peter Lambecius*;(63) *Henry Jul. Blum*, professor at Helmstadt, a learned but vain man;(64) *Daniel Nessel*;(65) *Andrew Fromm*;(66) *Bartholt Nihusius*, *Christ. Hellwig*, *Matth. Prætorius*;(67) and some others of inferior note and standing, revolted to the Romish party. But if you except from among them, all such as we are abundantly assured were led to this change by their domestic misfortunes, by their desire to advance their rank and glory, by their inordinate love of wealth and worldly advantages, by their fickleness of mind, by their imbecility of intellect, or by other causes of no better character, you will reduce the whole number to a few persons, whom no one will greatly envy the Roman Catholics.(68)

(58) [*Besold* was a learned and excellent man, professor of law at Tubingen, and after his conversion to the Romish church in 1635, professor at Ingolstadt. He published his motives; and appears to have been sincere; though the timidity of his character, and the troubled state of the times, seem to have had an influence. His revolt was a serious loss to the Protestants. See *Henke's* Kirchengesch., vol. iii., p. 517, and *Schlegel's* note here.—*Tr.*]

(59) [He was the son of the famous *Ægidius Hunnius*, and brother to *Nicholas*. He was professor of law at Giessen and Marpurg, turned Catholic in 1631, was made counsellor and vice-chancellor at Treves, and died in 1636. See *Henke* and *Schlegel*, l. c.—*Tr.*]

(60) [This celebrated anatomist travelled for improvement as far as Italy. On his return, he was made professor of anatomy at Copenhagen. But preferring Italy, he soon removed to that country. There, at the age of 37, in the year 1675, he became a real Catholic, changed his profession, was created a titular bishop, and sent as papal legate into Germany; where he died in 1686. He was first a great anatomist, and then a very sincere Catholic, and a man of blameless life. He wrote many tracts in defence of popery. See *Jo. Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. ii., p. 867, &c.—*Tr.*]

(61) [See *Henke's* Kirchengesch., vol. iv., p. 305. He apostatized in 1694; published his apology for it; and died the next year. —*Tr.*]

(62) [This distinguished literary man was born at Hamburg, in 1596; first studied medicine, but afterwards devoted himself to Latin and Greek literature, and to ecclesiastical antiquities. He early travelled to Italy and Sicily. Returning, he pursued study in Holland. Being denied a scholarship at Leyden, he left there in disgust, and after travelling a year or two, settled in Paris A.D. 1624. Here he was promoted, became a Catholic, and an author. He next went to Italy, where he was in high esteem; was made librarian to the pope, and came near to being a cardinal. He died 1661, aged 65. He was one of the most learned men of his age, and a sincere Catholic, but not bigoted. See *Jo. Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, vol. i., p. 257, and vol. iii., p. 321–342.—*Tr.*]

(63) [*Lambecius* was a countryman and nephew of *Holstenius*, and a rector at Hamburg. But he had a bad wife, and besides fell also into ill fame as a teacher of false doctrine. He therefore abandoned his country, office, wife, and religion, and became a librarian at Vienna.—*Schl.* This very learned man, and voluminous writer and editor, died in 1680, aged 52. See *Jo. Möller*, Cimbria Litterata, vol. i., p. 323, and vol. iii., p 391–414.—*Tr.*]

(64) He apostatized in 1654. [See above, note (52).—*Tr.*] See *Jac. Burckard's* Historia Biblioth. Augustæ, pt. iii., p. 223, 233. *Gruber's* Commercium Epistol-Leibnitianum, tom. i., p. 41, 95, 135, 137, 379, 388, 410, &c. In these Epistles, he is usually called *Florus*.

(65) [He was the son of *Martin Nessel*, a rector of Bremen, and studied law. He and his father both turned Catholics, in 1667. *Daniel* succeeded *Lambecius*, as librarian at Vienna, and died A.D. 1700. See *Henke's* Kirchengesch., vol. iv., p. 302.—*Tr.*]

(66) [He was a provost at Berlin, and from the year 1662, laboured much to unite the Protestants and Catholics. His apostacy took place at Prague, in 1667. See *Henke*, loc. cit., iv., p. 303; and *Schlegel's* note here.—*Tr.*]

(67) [Concerning *Nihusius*, see above, p. 298, note (43). *Prætorius* was noticed also, p. 294, note (32). *Hellwig* was a physician, and son-in-law to *J. P. Pfeiffer*, mentioned in note (61). He apostatized with his father-in-law, A.D. 1694.—*Tr.*]

(68) Of these men, and others of a similar character, an account is given by *Godfr. Arnold*, Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. ii.,

§ 17. Those Christians of the East who were not of the Romish communion, opposed the papal envoys no less firmly than the Europeans. Nor do the more ingenuous Catholics themselves deny, that those who give us splendid accounts of the great extension of the papal authority among the Nestorians and Monophysites, and of the favourable disposition of several of the prelates of these sects towards the Romish church, deceive us with fictitious statements.(69) On the other hand, the sovereign pontiffs suffered two very severe losses in the East, during this century; the one was in Japan, the other in Abyssinia. What occurred in Japan, has already been stated, among the evils which the Christian cause in general experienced. It therefore remains only to give some account of the occurrences in Abyssinia or Ethiopia.—In the beginning of the century, the mission to the Abyssinians which had been interrupted in the preceding century, was renewed by the Portuguese Jesuits with very favourable auspices. For the emperor *Susneius*, who assumed the name of *Seltam Segued* at his coronation after his victories over his enemies, influenced partly by the eloquence of the Jesuits, and partly by the hope of confirming his authority by the aid of Portuguese troops, committed the direction of all religious affairs, in the year 1625, to *Alphonzo Mendez* a missionary from Portugal; or in other words, created him *patriarch* of the nation. The next year, he not only himself publicly swore obedience to the authority of the Roman pontiff, but also required all his people to forsake the religion of their fathers, and to embrace that of Rome. But that new prelate with his associates, by his ill-timed zeal, himself subverted the foundations of the papal authority, which appeared to be so well established. For in the first place, he resolved to subdue the people, (the greatest part of whom together with their ministers held their ancient religion more dear than life itself), by means of terror, wars, and very severe punishments, in the manner of the *Portuguese Inquisition*. In the next place, the prelate ordered those who yielded obedience to the commands of the emperor, to be baptized and consecrated anew, after the Roman form; as if they had previously been entirely without the true Christian ordinances: which was an injury to the religion of their fathers, that the clergy regarded with more horror than they did the tortures and violence inflicted on recusants. And lastly, he did not hesitate to rend the commonwealth into factions, and to encroach even upon the authority and the prerogatives of the emperor. Hence arose, first, civil commotions and formidable insurrections; then, the indignation of the emperor himself, and a general abhorrence of the Jesuits; and finally, a public edict of the emperor in 1631, which gave the citizens full liberty to embrace which of the two religions they preferred. The son of Seltam, *Basilides*, who succeeded to the throne on the death of his father in 1632, thought proper to clear the country of these trouble-

book xvii., ch iii., p. 912, &c. *Weismann's* Historia Eccles., sæcul. xvii, p. 738. *Walch's* Einleitung in die Religions-Streitigkeiten, vol. ii., p. 728, &c. [*Henke's* Kirchengeschichte, vol iii. and iv.] With these may be joined the best writers on civil and literary history.

(69) See the express declarations of *Jo. Chardin*, in various parts of the latest edition of his travels. Add, respecting the Armenians, *Urban Cerry*, Etât présent de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 170: also concerning the Copts, p. 216, 222, &c. That some small but poor congregations were collected among these sects, no one denies. Thus, near the middle of the century, the Capuchins collected a very small company of popish converts among the Asiatic Monophysites, whose prelate resides at Aleppo. See *Le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. ii., p. 1408.

some strangers; and therefore in the year 1634, he drove *Mendez* and the whole body of Jesuits and Portuguese from Abyssinia, with no kind of indulgence or tenderness.(70) From this time onward, such an abhorrence of the Roman name became firmly rooted in the breasts of the Abyssinians, that they most cautiously guard their frontiers, lest some Jesuit or other priest of the Romish communion should creep into the country, and again embroil their commonwealth. The Roman pontiffs at first sought to repair the damage done by the Jesuits, by sending out two French Capuchin monks: and these being stoned to death by the Abyssinians, as soon as they were discovered, recourse was had to more secret methods; and at last the authority of *Lewis* XIV. king of France was resorted to, in order to open a door for the access of their missionaries to Ethiopia.(71) But to the present time, they have not been able, so far as we know, to calm the wakeful indignation of that highly-incensed nation.(72)

(70) See *Job. Ludolf's* Historia Æthiopica, lib. iii., cap. xii. *Mich. Geddes*, Church History of Ethiopia, p. 233, &c. *Matur. Veisse la Croze's* Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie, p. 79, &c. *Jerome Lobo's* Voyage d'Abyssinie, p. 116, 130, 144, and *Henry le Grand's* Additions to it, p. 173, and his fourth Dissertation, subjoined to vol. ii., p. 32. The judgment of this learned man, respecting the Jesuit *Mendez*, in this Diss. iv., p. 36, is worth transcribing. Il eût été à souhaiter que le Patriarche ne se fut pas chargé de tant d'affaires, (thus cautiously does he speak of *Mendez's* lust of power, and intrusion into the affairs of the civil government), et qu'il n'eût pas fait tant valoir son autorité, en se conduisant en Abyssinie, comme dans un pays d'Inquisition. Il revolta tout le monde, et rendit les Catholiques, et en particulier les Jesuites, si odieux, que la haine qu'on a conçûe contre eux dure encore aujourdhui.—["The third Book of *La Croze's* History, which relates to the progress and ruin of this mission, is translated by *Mr. Lockman* into English, and inserted in *The Travels of the Jesuits*, vol. i., p. 308 &c., as also is *Poncet's* Voyage, mentioned in the following note."—*Macl.*]

(71) These projects are mentioned by *Urban Cerry*, Etât present de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 217, &c. *Henry le Grand*, Supplement to *Lobo's* Itinerar. Æthiopicum, tom. i., p. 181, &c.; tom. ii., p. 108, &c. ["Father *Lobo*, who resided nine years in Ethiopia, has given an elegant and lively, though simple and succinct description of that vast empire, in his Itinerarium Æthiopicum. This Itinerary was translated into French by *M. le Grand*, and enriched by him with several curious anecdotes and dissertations. Hence *Dr. Mosheim* sometimes quotes the *Itinerarium* under the title of *Voyage d'Abyssinie*, referring to *Le Grand's* French translation of it."—*Macl.*] I wish the reader to compare the statements made from documents which are above all suspicion, by this papist [*Le Grand*] who was not unfriendly to the Jesuits, with the *Voyage* of that French physician, *Charles James Poncet*, who travelled into Ethiopia in the year 1698, in company with the Jesuit *Brevedent* who died on the way; which *Voyage* was published by the Jesuits, in the fourth volume of the Lettres curieuses et édifiantes des Missions étrangeres, Paris, 1713, 8vo, [in the ed. Lyons, 1819, tom. ii., p. 238, &c. —*Tr.*] The discerning reader may thus learn, how much reliance is to be put on the statements which the Jesuits give us, of the friendly disposition of the Asiatic and African Christians towards the see of Rome. After ingenuously and candidly making this comparison, he will perhaps declare, that Grecian and even Punic faith, is more to be trusted than that of the Jesuits.

(72) The biographers of *Clement* XI. and especially *Lafitau* and *Reboulet*, amuse us with fables, (invented perhaps by the Jesuits and their friends), when they tell us of the Abyssinian emperor's embracing the Romish religion in the year 1712; or of his petitioning the Roman pontiff in 1703 to send him teachers, to instruct him and his people. On the contrary, it is fully ascertained that but a few years ago, the Abyssinians most rigorously denied not only to all Europeans but also to the Turks, all access to their country; nay, they would not allow Egyptian Monophysites who entered Ethiopia, to return again. This is confirmed by the best possible testimony in such a case, that of *Benedict Maillet*, who long filled the office of French consul in Egypt, and was appointed by *Louis* XIV. ambassador to the emperor of Abyssinia; in his Description de l'Egypte, pt. i., p. 325, Paris, 1735, 4to. To him we add *Henry le Grand*, who in his Additions to *Jerome Lobo's* Itinerarium, pt. i., p.

§ 18. We have thus far spoken of the external prosperity or adversity of the Romish church, and of the zeal of the pontiffs to extend the limits of their empire: we now proceed to examine its internal state. The ancient form of government was in no respects changed; yet the officers of the church were in most countries, gradually abridged of no small part of their ancient power by the civil authorities. For that happy age was everywhere gone by, when the clergy might excite public commotions, engage in civil affairs at their pleasure, terrify with their sacred denunciations, and impose contributions and other burdens upon the citizens. The supreme pontiff himself, though saluted with the same appellations and titles as formerly, often experienced with vast regret, that names had lost much of their ancient power and import, and were still losing more and more. The principle formerly held only by the French, that the power of the Roman pontiff was wholly and exclusively confined to sacred and ecclesiastical affairs, and by no means extended to secular things, to the property, the persons, and the business of the citizens, had now become wellnigh the universal opinion of all kings and princes. The schools indeed in most parts of the Romish world, with the public writers, extolled the majesty of the pontiff to the utmost of their ability; and the Jesuits, who wished to be thought among the first defenders of the Romish see and power, did the same; and even the courts of princes sometimes used magnificent language, respecting the dignity and authority of the head and father of the church. But the misfortune was, that in this as in other cases, men's actions did not accord with their language; and the sovereign princes, when any question or controversy arose with the court of Rome, measured the rights and prerogatives of the pontiff not as formerly by the decisions of the schools, but by their own convenience and interests.

§ 19. This the sovereign pontiffs experienced to their great detriment, as often as they ventured in this age to resume their former pretensions, and to encroach upon the jurisdiction of sovereign states. In the year 1606, *Paul* V. a haughty pontiff, laid the Venetians under an interdict; because they presumed to punish certain priests who had committed crimes, and forbid the erection of any more sacred edifices in their territories without the consent of the senate, and prohibited all farther transfers of estates to the clergy without permission from the government. But the senate of Venice most firmly and vigorously resisted this wrong. For in the first place, they would not allow the priests to intermit the sacred services, as the pontiff commanded; and the Jesuits and Capuchins, who chose to obey the pontiff rather than the senate, were banished the country. In the next place, they ordered *Paul Sarpi*, a theologian of the republic who was a monk of the order of *Servitors* and a man of very great genius, and other persons deeply learned in civil and ecclesiastical law, to demonstrate the justice of their cause in several treatises, and to inquire with great freedom into the true limits of the papal power: and their attacks were so powerful, that *Cæsar Baronius* and the other writers to

222. (published in 1728), after faithfully detailing all the projects of the French and the popes in our age for introducing Romish priests into Abyssinia, subjoins, that all such projects must necessarily appear vain and chimerical to persons acquainted with the state of things in Ethiopia: Toutes ces enterprises paroîtront chimeriques à ceux qui connoîtront l'Abissinie et les Abissins. Perhaps the mission which is now fitting out at Rome to the Abyssinians, will add new confirmation to this opinion.

whom the Roman pontiff trusted the defence of his cause, could with difficulty stand up against them. When at length *Paul* V. prepared for war against the Venetians, *Henry* IV. king of France, interposed and brought about a peace, but on terms that were not very honourable to the pontiff.(73) For the Venetians could not be induced to rescind entirely those decrees which had given offence to the Romish bishop, nor to allow the banished Jesuits to return to their country.(74) The senate of Venice, at that time, contemplated a secession from the Romish church; and the English and Dutch ambassadors endeavoured to persuade them to such a step. But many causes of great weight, prevented the measure: nor did the sagacious and circumspect *Sarpi* himself, though he was no friend to the Romish court, appear to approve the thing.(75)

§ 20. If the Portuguese had possessed as much wisdom and courage as the Venetians, equally unsuccessful would have been the contest which

(73) Besides *Thuanus* (*de Thou*), and other historians, see *Gabr. Daniel's* Histoire de France, tome x., p. 358, &c., of the recent edit. *Jo. Hen. Heidegger's* Historia Papatus, period vii., § ccxx., p. 322, &c.—*Jo. Wolfg. Jæger's* Historia Eccles., sæcul. xvii., decenn. i., p. 108. But especially the writings of the celebrated *Paul Sarpi* and of the other Venetian theologians, deserve a careful perusal. For being written with no less solidity than erudition and elegance, these works contributed most to open the eyes of kings and magistrates, and to lead them no longer to yield implicit obedience to the will of the pontiffs, as had formerly been done. Pre-eminent among these writings, is the Istoria delle cose passate entre Paul V. et la Republ. di Venetia; composed by *Paul Sarpi*, who is usually called *Fra Paolo*, i. e., *Brother Paul;* printed Mirandol., 1624, 4to; and the Historia Interdicti Veneti, by the same author, which was printed at Cambridge, 1626, 4to, by *William Bedell*, at that time chaplain to the English embassy at Venice, and afterwards a bishop in Ireland *Paul* V. therefore, whose rashness and imprudence led the Venetians to publish these books, was himself the cause of those very great perplexities which the Romish see afterwards often experienced.

(74) The Venetians indeed, a long time afterwards, in the year 1657, when *Alexander* VII. governed the Romish church, being wearied with the importunities of several princes and especially of *Louis* XIV. king of France, suffered the Jesuits to return to their territories. Yet quite down to our age, no where is this very powerful society under more restraint than among the Venetians; to its own loss, it finds the old grudge remaining deep fixed in the public mind. See the Voyage Historique en Italie, Allemagne, Suisse; Amsterd., 1736, 8vo, vol. i., p. 291. To this day, the pontifical rescripts and *bulls* have just so much power among the Venetians, as the interests of the republic and the judgment of the senate will allow them to have. I adduce as a most credible witness cardinal *Henry Noris*, who (in the Epistles of famous Venetians to *Ant. Magliabechi*, vol. i., p. 67) thus wrote, in the year 1676: Poche Bulle passevano quelle acque verso le parte del Adriatico, per le massime lasciate nel Testamento di Fra Paolo. That is: Few bulls of the pontiffs pass the waters of the Po and reach the shores of the Adriatic: they are prohibited by the maxims which Brother Paul laid down in his last Testament.

(75) This project of the Venetians is expressly treated of, by *Gilbert Burnet* in his Life of William Bedell, p. 18, &c., of the French edit., and by *Peter Francis le Courayer*, Defense de la nouvelle Traduction de l'Histoire du Concile de Trente, p. 35, &c., Amsterd., 1742, 8vo, who shows very clearly, that *Sarpi* departed indeed in many respects from the opinions of the Romish church, yet that he did not approve of all the doctrines of the Protestants; nor would he recommend to the Venetians, to separate from the Romish church. [From the account of the agent for a union *Jo. Bapt. Lenke*, to the elector Palatine, which the keeper of the records *Gattler*, has given in an appendix to the Hist. of the duchy of Würtemberg, vol. vi., No. 10, p. 57, it appears, that in the year 1609 a Protestant congregation of more than 1000 persons, among whom were about 300 gentry of the principal families, then actually existed at Venice; which Brother *Paul Sarpi* and his friend *Fulgenzo* had collected, and which contemplated under favourable circumstances to abandon popery. The substance of this account is also in *Le Bret's* Magazin zum Gebrauch der Staaten-und Kirchengesch., vol. ii., p. 235, &c.—*Schl.*]

Urban VIII. commenced against them in 1641, and which continued till the year 1666. The Portuguese having driven out the Spaniards, made *John* duke of Braganza, their king. *Urban* and his successors pertinaciously refused either to acknowledge *John* as king of Portugal, or to confirm the bishops appointed by him, though urged to it in a thousand ways both by the Portuguese and the French. The consequence was, that the greatest part of the Portuguese territories was for a long time without bishops. The vicar of Christ who above all things should have no fear of man, had such a dread of Spanish resentment, that rather than offend the king of Spain, he chose to violate his most sacred duty and leave great numbers of churches without pastors. The king of Portugal was advised from various quarters, and especially by the French, to imitate the example of the Venetians; and to cause his bishops to be consecrated by a national council of Portugal, in despite of the pontiff: and he seemed at times, disposed to act with vigour. But the ascendency of the Inquisition, and the amazing superstition of the people and their devotion to the will of the pontiff, prevented his adopting energetic measures. Thus, it was not till after the lapse of twenty-five years, and the conclusion of a peace with the Spaniards, that *Clement* IX. confirmed the bishops appointed by the king. Yet in this the Portuguese showed themselves men, that they strenuously resisted the pontiff when he endeavoured to take advantage of this contest to extend his power in Portugal; nor would they suffer the ancient prerogative of their kings, to designate the bishops of the country, to be at all abridged.(76)

§ 21. For many centuries there had been almost perpetual controversy between the French nation and the popes; which, as in other periods, so also in this century, sometimes came to an open rupture. If the pontiffs ever employed cunning and perseverance in any cause, they certainly did so throughout this century, in their endeavours to subdue the hostility of the French to the Romish power, and to destroy or gradually undermine what are called the *liberties of the Gallic church:* and their principal coadjutors in this business were the Jesuits. But to these machinations, very strong opposition was constantly made, both by the parliament of Paris, and by the very able writers, *Edmund Richer*, *John Launoy*, *Peter de Marca*, *Natalis Alexander*, *Lewis Ellies du Pin*, and others; who had the courage to bring forward the opinions of their ancestors, some with more spirit and erudition, and others with less, and to confirm them with new arguments and authorities. The court indeed, did not always reward these protectors of their country according to their merits; nay, frequently showed itself opposed to them, with a view to please the angry and menacing pontiff; yet this afforded little advantage to the papal cause. The French kings it seems, would rather have their rights silently maintained, than publicly defended with noise and war, in open declarations and disputations; nor did they esteem it below their dignity to temporize occasionally, and to pretend great reverence for the mandates and edicts of the pontiffs, in order more easily to obtain from them the objects of their

(76) See *Mich. Geddes*, History of the pope's behaviour towards Portugal, from 1641 to 1666; which is in his Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. ii., p. 73–186. The cause of the Portuguese in this contest, was learnedly defended among the French, by *Ism. Bullald*, whose Libelli duo pro Ecclesiis Lusitanis, ad Clerum Gallicanum, were reprinted at Helmstadt, 1700, 4to.

wishes.(77) But if they perceived the Romish prelates taking advantage of this complaisance to extend their authority, they remembered that they were kings of the French, that is, of a nation for a long time most impatient of Romish servitude. This is abundantly confirmed by the contests of *Lewis* XIV. with the pontiffs.(78)

(77) ["It was with a view to this, that *Voltaire*, speaking of the manner in which the court of France maintains its prerogatives against the Roman pontiff, says pleasantly, that *the king of France kisses the pope's feet, and ties up his hands.*"—*Macl.*]

(78) Many, both of the Lutherans and Reformed, and they men of great merit and learning, lament the augmentation of the Romish power in France during this century, and the gradual corruption of the minds of both the noblesse and the clergy, by the prevalence of Italian notions respecting the papal power, which the ancient French people viewed with abhorrence; and from this they infer, that the famous *liberties of the Gallic church* were much abridged in this century, by the influence principally of the Jesuits. Into these views they are led, partly by certain measures of the French monarchs, which have the appearance of greatly subserving the wishes of the pontiffs; and partly by the numberless declamations of the Jansenists and other recent French writers, who lament, that the ancient glory has departed from the French nation, that the edicts of the popes are held in immense veneration, that the Jesuits have imbued the minds of the monarchs and of the leading men in the government, with excessive attachment to the Romish views, that vigilance is used against all those who wish to see the opinions of their ancestors prevail, that the tribunal of the *Inquisition* is gradually introduced, and other things of this sort. But I am persuaded that more reliance is placed on these representations, than ought to be, and that the rights of the French people are still in the same state as formerly: nor am I able at all to discern those triumphs of the pontiffs over the French, which many excellent men, with the French who are too indignant, especially the Jansenists and the *Appellants*, think they can clearly see. As the general policy of the French government is much more artful and crafty, in the present age; so the machinations of the pontiffs are thwarted, by more silent and artful methods, than in the preceding more rude age. The same conflict is kept up as before: but it is now managed in a very different way. And this new and politic course, does not meet the views of many of the French; who are of an ardent temperament, and who think they ought to contend in open manly warfare, in the manner of their fathers. Hence those sighs, and lamentations over the rights of the nation invaded and almost annihilated by the craftiness of the Jesuits. If these persons could check those passions, with which Frenchmen are so prone to be agitated, and would carefully examine the history of their country, they would certainly learn, that their liberties are not extinct; nor are they neglected by their monarchs, but are only maintained with more caution and foresight. France, I am aware, is full of persons who basely flatter the pontiffs, and seem inclined to become slaves, for the sake of gain or of honours. But the number of such, was no less formerly, than it is now; as might be proved by numberless examples. Nor is it common for states to be ruled and governed by such characters. The Jesuits are in high authority; and they sometimes cause things to be done, which cannot but be grievous to the friends of the ancient Gallic liberties; things of this sort occurred also in those times when there were no Jesuits: and on the other hand, very many things occur, continually, which are most adverse to the wishes of the Jesuits, and which undoubtedly give much disquietude to the pontiffs. Those who contend learnedly for the opinions of their ancestors, sometimes scarcely escape without punishment: those who dispute with warmth, not unfrequently suffer for it, and are either imprisoned, or sent into exile: and the most modest writers receive no reward for their labours. True; it is so. Yet the cause which these men defend, is not disapproved of, nor is it deserted; but *their* manner of supporting it is disliked. For the monarchs and their friends, in reality, choose to have the machinations of the pontiffs resisted, without noise and clamour, rather than by publications and disputation, which often produce parties in a nation, excite the passions of men, disturb the public peace, and exasperate the pontiffs and alienate them from the French nation. At the same time, the public teachers are at full liberty to instil into their pupils the ancient principles of the nation, and to explain fully in the schools those views, by which the Romish lust of power has usually been for ages repressed. Some things take place, which are inconsistent with these principles; and restraint is laid upon those who think it very hard to depart from the customs and practices of their fathers; yet this is almost never done, unless either necessity, or the prospect

§ 22. The first of these contests occurred in the time of *Alexander* VII., and originated from the temerity of the pontiff's Corsican guards; who, in the year 1662, ventured to insult the king's ambassador, the marquis *Crequi*, and his lady, at the instigation as it is reported, of *Alexander's* nephew. The French monarch determined to avenge the insult by a war: but on the pope's imploring his mercy, he granted him peace in 1664 at Pisa, on the following conditions among others; that he should send his nephew to Paris, to ask pardon, and that he should brand the Corsican nation with infamy by a public edict, and erect a pillar in the Farnesian market, on which this crime and the punishment of it should be inscribed for future generations. But this contest of the king, was not so much with the pontiff as head of the church, as with *Alexander* considered as a prince and a temporal sovereign.(79) With the pontiff in his proper character, the monarch had controversy in 1678 and the following years when *Innocent* XI. filled the Romish see. The subject of this controversy was, the *right* which the French call *Régale;* according to which, when a bishop dies, the king is allowed to collect and enjoy the revenues of the see, and in some respects to act in the place of bishop, until the see is filled by the accession of a new prelate. *Lewis* wished to subject all the sees in his kingdom to this right: but *Innocent* would not permit it, determining that the king's power in this particular should extend to no more sees than formerly. This contest was carried on with great passion on both sides. To the many admonitions and epistles of the pontiff, the king opposed severe laws and mandates: and when the pope refused his approbation to the bishops appointed by the king, the latter by his regal authority, caused them to be inducted into office; thus showing publicly, that the Gallic church could get along without a pope. On the other hand, the high-spirited and persevering pontiff denounced the vengeance of Heaven against the king; and omitted nothing which might show, that the ancient power of the pontiffs was not yet extinct.(80) The king, offended by this reso-

of some great advantage, warrants it. Besides, the public authorities take good care, that the pontiffs shall derive no great benefit from such condescensions to them. That this was the fact in the affair of the *Bull Unigenitus*, in which many things occurred not agreeing with the ancient customs and opinions of the French, will be readily seen, by those who will examine carefully the whole transaction, and compare the public decisions with the actual state of the country. It was judged best, frequently to admit a less evil, in order to avoid a greater. In short, the kings of France are wont to treat the sovereign pontiff as the ancient heroes who descended into the infernal regions, treated the dog *Cerberus* that guarded the gate of that dark world, (no offence is intended by this comparison), sometimes throwing him a cake, when he growled, and sometimes awing him with their brandished swords, as occasion and circumstances demanded; and both for the same object, namely, that they might freely march on in their chosen way. —These remarks I thought proper to extend thus far, lest those who read the bitter complaints and declamations of the Jansenists and *Appellants*, should put entire confidence in them; which many *Protestants* have done, and particularly those who are not well acquainted with the world.

(79) See *Jo. Wolfg. Jæger's* Historia Eccles., sæcul. xvii., decenn. vii., lib ii., cap. ii., p. 180, &c. *Voltaire's* Siecle de Louis XIV., tom. i., p. 131, &c. The French also published some tracts, in which the history of this contest was related. Memoirs de la Reine Christine, tom. ii., p. 72, &c. [*Jo. Gifford's* History of France, vol. iv., p. 379. —*Tr.*]

(80) See *Jo. Henr. Heidegger's* Historia Papatus, period vii., § ccexli., &c., p. 555. *Voltaire*, Siécle de Louis XIV., tom. ii., p. 210, and numerous others, who either professedly or incidentally, treat of the right of *Régale*, and of the disputes that grew out of it. *Henry Noris* discusses very copiously the history of the origin and progress of this right, in his Istoria delle investiture Ecclesiastique, p. 547, &c., in his Opp., vol. v.

lute behaviour, in the year 1682, assembled at Paris that famous convention of his bishops, in which the ancient opinions of the French respecting the power of the pontiff, as being exclusively spiritual, and inferior to that of councils, were stated in four propositions, unanimously adopted, confirmed, and set forth as the perpetual rule for all the clergy as well as for the schools.(81) But *Innocent* received this blow also with manly courage.(82) This violent contest was soon after followed by another. In

[See also *Gilbert Burnet*, in his History of the rights of Princes in the disposing of Ecclesiastical Benefices and Church lands, relating chiefly to the pretensions of the crown of France to the *Régale*, and the late contests with the court of Rome; Lond., 1682, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(81) [This convention was composed of 8 archbishops, 26 bishops, and 38 other clergymen; who all set their names to the four following propositions:

I. That, God has given to *St. Peter*, and to his successors, the vicars of Christ, and to the church itself, power in spiritual things, and things pertaining to salvation; but not power in civil and temporal things: Our Lord having said, *My kingdom is not of this world*; and again, *Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's*. And therefore, that injunction of the apostle stands firm: *Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. There is no power, but is from God; and the powers that be, are ordained of God.* Therefore, in temporal things, kings and princes are subject to no ecclesiastical power of God's appointment; neither can they either directly or indirectly, be deposed by authority of the keys of the church; nor can their subjects be exempted from fidelity and obedience, nor be absolved from their oath of allegiance. And this principle, which is necessary to the public tranquillity, and no less useful to the church than to the state, ought by all means to be held fast, as being consonant to the word of God, to the tradition of the fathers, and to the example of the saints.

II. That, plenary power in spiritual things so exists in the apostolic see, and in the successors of Peter, the vicars of Christ, that at the same time, the decrees of the holy ecumenical council of Constance, approved by the apostolic see, and confirmed by the practice of the Roman pontiffs and of the whole church, and observed by the Gallican church with perpetual veneration, respecting the authority of general councils, as contained in the fourth and fifth sessions, must also be valid, and remain immoveable. Nor does the Gallican church approve of those, who infringe upon the force of these decrees, as if they were of dubious authority, or not fully approved, or who pervert the words of the council, by referring them solely to a time of schism.

III. Hence, the exercise of the apostolic power is to be tempered by the canons, which the Spirit of God dictated, and which the reverence of the whole world has consecrated. The rules, customs, and regulations received by the Gallic realm and church, are also valid, and the terms of the fathers remain immoveable: and it concerns the majesty of the apostolic see, that statutes and usages confirmed by the consent of so great a see and of such churches, should retain their appropriate validity.

IV. In questions of faith, likewise, the supreme pontiff has a principal part, and his decrees have reference to all and singular churches; yet his judgment is not incapable of correction, unless it have the assent of the church.

These propositions, approved by *Lewis* XIV., and registered by the parliament of Paris on the 23d of March, 1682, were ordered to be publicly read and expounded in the schools from year to year, and to be subscribed to by all clergymen and professors in the universities. See *Jac. Benig. Bossuet's* Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani; the documents at the beginning of vol. i.—*Tr.*]

(82) These four propositions, which were extremely adverse to his wishes, the pontiff caused to be opposed both publicly and privately. The most distinguished person that defended the cause of the pontiff, was cardinal *Celestine Sfondrati*; who, under the assumed name of *Eugene Lombard*, published: Regale sacerdotium Romano Pontifici assertum et quatuor propositionibus explicatum, 1684, 4to. The form of the types shows, that the book was printed in Switzerland. Next to him, in the multitude of Italians, Spaniards, and Germans, who supported the tottering majesty of the pontiff against the French, *Nicholas du Bois*, a doctor of Louvain, stood conspicuous. He published some books on the subject, which are mentioned by *Bossuet*. But all these were confuted by the very eloquent bishop of Meaux, *Jac. Benign. Bossuet*, in a learned work composed by order of the king, but which was not published, till long after his death, entitled: Defensio declarationis celeberrimæ, quam de

the year 1687, *Innocent* deprived the ambassadors resident at Rome, and among others the French ambassador *Lavardin*, of the right of asylum; because it often rendered criminals secure of impunity. The king employed all the means his angry feelings could suggest, to induce the pontiff to restore the right he had taken away: but the latter met the king with an open front, and could by no means be persuaded to put on even the semblance of yielding.(83) This long conflict, which was injurious to both the parties, was at length closed by the death of *Innocent*. The subsequent pontiffs were more pliable, and therefore more ready to remove the principal causes of contention: yet they were not so careless, as to forget the dignity of the Romish see. The right of asylum was abrogated, with the consent of the king: the controversy respecting the *right of Régale*, was adjusted by a compromise.(84) The four celebrated propositions respecting the power of the pontiff, without objection from the king, were gilded over by some bishops, in private letters to the pope; but they were by no means given up. To the present day, they maintain their place among the laws of the realm.

§ 23. That the faults, which had long characterized the bishops and some of the inferior clergy in the Romish church, were rather increased than diminished, no good man even of that community will deny. The bishops every where owed their elevation, rarely to their piety and merit, generally to personal friendships, to services rendered to individuals, to simony, to affinities and relationships, and often even to their vices. And the greater part of them lived, as if they had been hired with their great salaries, expressly, to exhibit before the people examples of those very vices which the Christian religion condemns.(85) If there were some (as there doubtless were) who endeavoured to benefit their flocks, and who set themselves against both ignorance and wickedness, they were either put down by the enmity and hatred of the others, or at least fell under neglect, and were hindered from effecting any thing great and laudable. And nearly the same things were experienced by those clergymen of inferior rank, who exerted all their powers in behalf of truth and piety. These however, if compared with those whom voluptuousness, ambition, and lust for wealth drove headlong, were exceedingly few. Some indeed of the pontiffs of this century should not be defrauded of their just praise, for attempting to correct the morals of the clergy by wholesome laws, and to bring them to exhibit at least common decency in their lives. Yet it is strange that these sagacious men should not see, that the very constitution of the Romish church and its whole interior structure, were insuperable obstacles to all such good designs; and that a pontiff, even if he were inspired, unless he also possessed more than human power and could be present in many

potestate Ecclesiastica sanxit Clerus Gallicanus, xix. Martii, 1683, Luxemburgi, 2 vols., 1730, 4to. For the king forbid the publication of the Defence, because, after the death of *Innocent*, there seemed to be a great prospect of peace; which in fact soon followed.

(83) See *Jager*, loc. cit., decenn. ix., p. 19, &c. The Legatio Lavardini, which was published, 1688, 12mo. But especially, Memoires de la Reine Christine, tome ii., p. 248, &c. For *Christina* engaged in this contest, and took sides with the king of France.

(84) See *Claude Fleury*, Institutio Juris Eccles. Gallici, p. 454, &c., of the Latin translation.

(85) See a multitude of proofs, collected from the most celebrated doctors of the Romish church, in the Memoires de Portroyal, tome ii., p. 308.

places at the same time, could never reduce such a heterogeneous mass of people to good order.

§ 24. The monks, though in many places more decent and circumspect in their lives than formerly, yet for the most part were extremely negligent of the rules and regulations of the founders of their orders. In the beginning of the century, as learned and good monks themselves admit, the state of all the monasteries was still lamentable. But as the century advanced, some wise men, first among the Benedictines in France and then also in other countries, endeavoured to *reform* certain monasteries; that is, to bring them back in some degree to the rules and laws of their order.(86) Their example was afterwards followed by other religious houses of the Cluniacensians, Cistercians, Regular Canons, Dominicans, and Franciscans.(87) At this time therefore, the monks of the Romish church became divided into two classes; namely, the *Reformed*, who abandoning their licentious and profligate manners, lived more decently and more conformably to the rules of their order; and the *Unreformed*, who disregarded the precepts of their founders, and chose to live as they found it convenient and pleasant, rather than austerely and according to the laws by which they were bound. But the number of the *Unreformed*, far exceeds that of the Reformed: and moreover most of the *Reformed* not only depart widely from the mode of living prescribed by their rule, but are also in one place and another gradually relapsing into their former negligence.

§ 25. Among the *Reformed* monastic associations, certain *Congregations* of Benedictines surpass the others, partly in the beauty and excellence of their regulations, and partly in the constancy with which they observe their rules. The most famous of these is, the French *Congregation of St. Maur*;(88) which was formed under the authority of *Gregory* XV. in 1621,

(86) *Le Bœuf*, Memoires sur l'Hist. d'Auxerre, tome ii., p. 513, &c., where there is a list of the first *Reforms* of this century. Voyage litteraire de deux Benedictins, pt. ii., p. 97, &c.

(87) There is an account of all the convents both Benedictines and others, which submitted to a *Reform* of any kind, in *Hipp. Helyot's* Histoire des Ordres, tome v., vi., vii., &c. To whose account however, numerous additions might be made. Of the *Reformed* congregation of Clugni, which commenced in the year 1621, the Benedictines have treated expressly in their Gallia Christiana, tom. vii., p. 544, &c. They also treat of the *Reformed* Canons Regular of St. Augustine, in tom. vii., p. 778, 787, 790. For an account of the *Reformed* Cistercians in France and Germany, see *Jo. Mabillon*, Annal. Benedictin., tom. vi., p. 121, &c. Voyage litteraire de deux Benedictins, tome i., p. 7, 8, tome ii., p. 133, 229, 269, 303. The *Reformed* Cistercians with great zeal attempted a *reformation* of their whole sect in this century; but in vain. See *Meaupou*, Vie de l'Abbé de la Trappe, tome i., p. 192, &c. I omit other notices, as requiring too much room.—[I find no more suitable place, to notice some *abolished orders* in this century. *Clement* XIV. in his bull for suppressing the order of Jesuits, mentions the Congregation of the Reformed Conventual Brethren, which *Sixtus* V. approved, but which *Urban* VIII. abolished, by his bull of Feb. 6, 1626, *because the above-named brethren did not yield spiritual fruits to the church of God; nay, very many disagreements had arisen between those Reformed conventual Brethren, and the Unreformed conventual Brethren:* and he allowed them to go over to the Capuchin brethren of St. Francis, or to the Observant Franciscans. According to the same bull, the order of Regulars of St. Ambrose and St. Barnabas ad nemus, was suppressed by the same pontiff. And in the year 1668, *Clement* IX. abolished the three regular orders of Canons Regular of St. Gregory in Alga, of Hieronymists de Fesulis, and of Jesuates, established by St. *Jo. Columbanus; because they were of little or no use to the church, and had loaned their revenues to the Venetian republic, to be applied to war against the Turks.* —*Schl.*]

(88) See the Gallia Christiana; not the old work of this name, but the new and elegant production of the Benedictines of this same Congregation of St. Maur; vol. vii.,

and endowed with various privileges and rights by *Urban* VIII. in 1627. This association does not indeed consist of genuine followers of *St. Benedict*, nor is it free from every thing censurable; yet it has many excellences which raise it above all others. Of these excellences the first and the most useful is, that it devotes a certain number of persons of superior genius to the cultivation of learning, both sacred and civil, and particularly to the study of history and antiquities; and that it furnishes them abundantly with all the helps they need, to prosecute their business with advantage.(89) Those who are acquainted with the history of learning, need

p. 474, &c. *Hipp. Helyot's* Histoire des Ordres, tome vi., cap. xxxvii., p. 256. The bull of *Gregory* XV. approving the society of St. Maur, is severely criticised in all its parts, by *Jo. Launoi*, that scourge of the monks even the best of them, in his Examen privilegii S. Germani; Opp., tom. iii., pt. i., p. 303. He also treats of the dissensions and commotions in this order, soon after its institution, (though with considerable prejudice, as is usual for him when speaking of monks), in his Assertio Inquisit. in privileg. S. Medardi, pt. i., cap. lxxvi., in his Opp., tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 227. [This Congregation consists of more than 180 Abbies and Conventual Priories, which are divided into six provinces; (extending over the greatest part of France); and it is governed by a General, two assistants, and six visiters, who are elected, as are the superiors of the several cloisters, every three years, in a general chapter of the order. As it is the object of this Congregation, to revive the spirit of *St. Benedict*, in the observance of his rule; so special care is taken to train up the young religious according to it. Hence, in each province one or two houses for novices are erected, from which, those to be admitted to profession are removed to other cloisters, where they are trained for two years to virtue and to acts and exercises of worship. After this, they study human learning and theology five years; and then spend one year in collecting their thoughts, and thus prepare themselves for orders and for more assiduity in their spiritual offices. In some cloisters there are also seminaries for the education of youth.—*Schl.*]

(89) The Benedictines talk largely of the great services done by this Congregation, in various ways; and among other difficult enterprises, they mention numerous cloisters of monks, which had collapsed and become corrupt, recovered and restored to order and respectability. See Voyage de deux Religieux Benedictins de la Congreg. de St. Maur, tome i., p. 16, tome ii., p. 47, and nearly throughout that work. And a person must be much prejudiced, who can look upon all these statements as fictions. There are however in the Romish community, persons who for various reasons dislike this society. First, some of the bishops are unfriendly to these learned Benedictines. For after these monks had thrown great light upon ancient history and upon diplomatics, by their learned works, they were able to defend their possessions, property, and rights, more learnedly and successfully, in the courts, against the bishops who coveted them, than when they were destitute of this literature and erudition. In the next place, the Jesuits, whose merits and glory were greatly obscured by the splendid works undertaken and accomplished by these Benedictines, endeavour to the utmost of their power to run down both them and their pursuits. See *Rich. Simon's* Lettres Choisies, tom. iv., p. 36, 45. Others are led by superstition, to indulge hatred of them; but it is perhaps a superstition tinctured with envy. For these Benedictines have substituted the pursuit of learning, in place of that of manual labour, which the rule of *St. Benedict* prescribes for his monks. The more robust are required to labour with their hands during certain hours of the day; but the more feeble, or such as possess superior genius, are taxed with intellectual or mental labour or the pursuit of sacred and secular learning. This is censured by certain austere persons, who are very fond of the ancient monastic discipline, and who think that literary pursuits are disreputable for monks, because they divert the mind from the contemplation of divine things. As this sentiment was advanced with excessive ardour, especially by *Armand John Bouthillier de Rance*, abbot of La Trappe, in his book des Devoirs Monastiques (on the duties of Monks); the most learned of the Benedictines, *John Mabillon*, was directed to defend the cause of his fraternity; which he did, in his well known work de Studiis Monasticis, which was first published, Paris, 1691, 8vo, and often afterwards, and translated also into the Latin and other languages. Hence arose that noted controversy in France, *How far is it suitable for a monk to cultivate literature:* an elegant history of which, has been given to the world by *Vincent Thuillier*, a very learned monk of the congregation of St. Maur; published among

not be informed how much this institution has benefited the literary world, or what a multitude of excellent and immortal works it has produced, illustrative of every branch of learning except philosophy.(90)

§ 26. But the best and most sacred of these changes were esteemed trivial and imperfect, by those whose eye was fixed on the ancient discipline and who wished to see the lives of monks strictly conformed to their first rules. The number of these in the Romish church was not inconsiderable; though they had little influence, and were odious to most persons, on account of their severity. These taught, that a monk should spend his whole life in prayers, tears, contemplation, sacred reading, and manual labour; and that whatever else might occupy him, however useful and excellent in itself, was inconsistent with his vocation, and therefore vain and not acceptable to God. Besides others who had not the fortune to become so celebrated, the Jansenists proposed this rigid reformation of the monks; and they exhibited some examples of it in France,(91) the most perfect and best known of which, was that which took place in the convent of sacred virgins bearing the name of *Port-Royal*, and which has flourished from the year 1618 down to the present time, [A.D. 1753].(92) Several emulated this example; but the most successful and zealous of all these was, in the year 1664, *Armand John Bouthillier de Rance*, abbot of La Trappe, a man of noble birth; who was so happy as to prevent the accusation of extravagant superstition, which the Jansenists had incurred, from being brought against his associates, notwithstanding they lived in the most austere manner of the old Cistercians;—nay, carried their austerity beyond the ancient discipline of the Cistercians. The fraternity established by this noted man, still flourishes, under the name of the *Reformed Bernardines of La Trappe*, and has been propagated among the Italians and the Spaniards: though, if credit is to be given to the testimony of many, it has gradually departed much from the very painful discipline of its founder.(93)

the Opera Posthuma Mabillonii et Ruinarti, tom. i., p. 365–425.

(90) A list of the writings and works with which the congregation of St. Maur have favoured the learned world, is given by *Philip le Cerf*, Bibliotheque Historique et Critique des Auteurs de la Congregation de S. Maur; Hague, 1726, 8vo, and by *Bernh. Pez*, Bibliotheca Benedictino-Mauriana; Augsburg, 1716, 8vo. These monks are going on with great perseverance to benefit both sacred and profane learning, by their elaborate and excellent productions. [A more complete catalouge of their works is in the Histoire litteraire de la Congregation de S. Maur, ordre de St. Benoit, ou l'on trouve la vie et les travaux des auteurs, qu'elle a produits depuis son origine en 1618, jusqu' à present, avec les titres, enumeration, l'analyse, des differentes editions des livres, qu'ils ont donnés au public, et le jugement, que les Savans en ont porté; ensemble la notice de beaucoup d'ouvrages manuscrits, composés par des Benedictins du même Corps; Brussels and Paris, 1770, 4to.—*Schl.*]

(91) See Memoires de Port Royal, tom. ii., p. 601, 602. In particular, that most celebrated Jansenist, *Martin de Barcos*, introduced the austere discipline of ancient monks into the monastery of *St. Cyran*, of which he was abbot. See Gallia Christiana, tom. ii., p. 132. *Moleon*, Voyages Liturgiques, p. 135, &c. But after his death, the monks of St. Cyran, like those of other places, relapsed into their old habits. See Voyage de deux Benedictins, tom. i., pt. i., p. 18, &c.

(92) *Helyot*, Histoire des ordres, tom. v., cap. xliv., p. 455.

(93) See *Marsollier*, Vie de l'Abbé de la Trappe, Paris, 1702, 4to, and 1703, 2 vols. 12mo. *Meaupou*, (a doctor of the Sorbonne), Vie de Mr. l'Abbé de la Trappe, Paris, 1702, 2 vols. 8vo. *Felibien*, Description de l'Abbaye de la Trappe, Paris, 1671, 12mo. *Helyot*, Histoire des Ordres, tom. vi., cap. i., p. 1, &c. [The author of this reformation lived, as the greater part of the French abbés now do, in a thoughtless unprincipled manner, and kept up an illicit intercourse with a French lady, Madame de

§ 27. Of the new orders of monks which arose in this century,—for that fruitful mother, the church, has never ceased to bring forth such fraternities,—we shall notice only those which have acquired some celebrity. We mention, first, the French society of *Fathers of the Oratory of the holy Jesus*, instituted in 1613, by *John Berulle* [*Peter de Berulle*], a man of various talents, who served the commonwealth and religion, the court and the church, with equal ability, and was at last a *cardinal*. This institution was, in reality, intended to oppose the Jesuits. It has trained up, and it is still training many persons eminent for piety, eloquence, and erudition. But through the influence of the Jesuits, who were its enemies, it fell under a suspicion of broaching new doctrines in certain of its publications. The priests who enter this fraternity, do not divest themselves of private property; but so long as they continue in the society, (and they are at liberty to retire from it whenever they please), they relinquish all prospects of admission to any sacred office which has attached to it fixed revenues or rank and honour. Yet they are required faithfully to discharge all the duties of *priests*, and to make it their greatest care and effort, to perfect themselves and others more and more continually, in the art of profitably discharging those duties. Their fraternities therefore, may not improperly be denominated schools for *pastoral theology*. In more recent times however, they have in fact begun to teach the liberal arts and sacred science.(94) With these we join the *Priests of the Missions*, an order found-

Montbazon. Her sudden death by the smallpox, and the unexpected sight of her mutilated corpse, brought him to the resolution of becoming a Carthusian. The common statement is this. The abbot had received no notice of the lady's sickness, and after an absence of six weeks, returned from the country to visit her. He went directly to her chamber, by a secret stairway with which he was acquainted, and there found her dead and her corpse mutilated. For the leaden coffin, which had been made for her, was too short, and it was found necessary to cut off her head. The sight of her corpse in the coffin, and her head on the table, so affected him, that he resolved to forsake the world, and to embrace the severest monastic order. *Vigneul-Marville*, (Melanges d'Hist. et de Litterature, Roterd., 1700, 8vo, tome iii., p. 126), contradicts this statement. He says, thus much only was true: the abbot had been a particular friend of this lady; and once, on waiting on her, he learned from a gentleman in her antechamber, that she had the smallpox, and was then wishing the attendance of a clergyman. The abbot went to call one; and on his return, found her dying. He was much affected on the occasion; but it was two or three years after this event, that he formed his rigorous establishment. And probably the additions and alterations of the story, were invented for the sake of giving it a romantic aspect. Be this as it may; the abbot changed his life, and established an order into which none would enter but melancholy people, who were weary of the whole world, and constantly in fear of losing heaven. They allowed of no scientific or literary pursuits, and in their library had none but devotional books. Their worship was continued day and night; and if a cloister contained so many as twenty-four monks, they were divided into three classes, which interchanged continually. All these monks lived very austerely; and observed a rigorous silence, conversing together only once a week, and then not on worldly things. Their time was divided between manual labour, the canonical exercises, and private devotion. They lived wholly on bread, herbs, and pulse.—*Schl.*]

(94) See *Hubert de Cerisy*, Vie du Cardinal Berulle, Fondateur de l'Oratoire de Jesus; Paris, 1646, 4to. *Jo. Morin's* Life, prefixed to his Antiquit. Orientales, p. 3, 4, 5, 110. *Rich. Simon's* Lettres Choisies, tome ii., p. 60, and his Bibliotheque Critique, (which he published under the name of *Saimore*), tome iii., p. 303, 324, 330, &c. On the character of *Berulle*, see *Adr. Baillet's* Vie de Richer, p. 220, 342. *Michael le Vassor*, Histoire de Louis XIII., tome iii., p. 397, &c. *Helyot*, Histoire des ordres, tome viii., cap. x., p. 53, &c. Gallia Christiana Benedictinor., tom. vii., p. 976, &c. [These *Fathers of the Oratory* must not be confounded with the Italian order of the same name, established in the preceding century, by *Philip Neri*. (See above, p. 96.)

ed by *Vincent de Paul*, who was canonized not long since. They were constituted a regular and legitimate society in 1632, by *Urban* VIII. To fulfil the designs of their founder, they must attend especially to three things; first, to improve and amend themselves daily, by prayers, meditation, reading and other things; secondly, to perform sacred missions among the people living in the country towns and villages, eight months in the year, in order to imbue the peasantry with religious knowledge and quicken their piety; (from which service, they derive their name of Priests of the *Missions*); and lastly, to superintend seminaries in which young men are educated for the priesthood, and to train up candidates for the sacred office.(95) Under the counsel and patronage of the Priests of the Missions, are the *Virgins of Love* or the *Daughters of Charity;* whose business it is, to minister to the indigent in sickness. They originated from a noble lady, *Louisa le Gras;* and received the approbation of *Clement* IX. in 1660.(96) The *Brethren and Sisters of the pious and Christian schools*, were instituted by *Nicholas Barre*, in 1678. They are usually called *Piarists;* and their principal object is, the education of poor children of both sexes.(97) But it would be tedious to expatiate on this subject, and to enumerate all the religious associations, which in the various parts of the Romish jurisdiction were now set up with great expectations, and then suddenly neglected and suffered to become extinct.

§ 28. The society of Jesuits, by which as its soul the whole body of the Romish community is governed, if it could have been oppressed and trodden to dust, by hosts of enemies, by numberless indignities, by the most horrid criminations, and by various calamities; must undoubtedly have become extinct, or at least have been divested of all reputation and confidence. The French, the Belgians, the Poles, the Italians, have attacked it with fury; and have boldly charged it, both publicly and privately, with every species of crimes and errors that the imagination can conceive, as most pernicious to the souls of men and to the peace and safety of civil governments. The Jansenists especially, and those who adopt altogether or in part their views, have exposed its character in numberless publications, strengthened not merely by satire and groundless declamation, but by demonstrations, testimony, and documents, of the most credible nature.(98) But this immense host of accusers and of most decided enemies, seems not so much to have weakened and depressed this

Both agree in this, that they devote themselves to learning; but the Italians pursue especially church history; while the French pursue all branches of learning. The founder of this order, *Berulle*, was in so high favour with the queen of France, *Anna* of Austria, that Cardinal *Richelieu* envied him: and his death which occurred in 1629, was so sudden, that some conjectured, he died of poison. The Fathers of the Oratory are not monks, but secular clergymen; nor do they chant any canonical hours. They are called Fathers of the *Oratory*, because they have no churches in which the sacraments are administered, but only chapels or *oratories*, in which they read prayers and preach.—*Schl.*]

(95) *M. Abely*, Vie de M. Vincent de Paul; Paris, 1664, 4to. *Helyot*, loc. cit., tom. viii., cap. xi., p. 64. Gallia Christiana, tom. vii., p. 998, &c.

(96) *Gobillon*, Vie de Madame de Gras, fondatrice des filles de la charite: Paris, 1676, 12mo.

(97) *Helyot*, Hist. des Ordres, tome viii., cap. xxx., p. 233.

(98) Here is matter for a volume, or rather for many large volumes. For there is scarcely any part of the Catholic world, which does not offer for our inspection, some conflict of the Jesuits with the magistrates, with other orders of monks, or with the bishops and other religious teachers: from which the Jesuits, though they might seem vanquished, yet finally came off victorious. An attempt was made to bring together all these facts, which lie scattered

very sagacious sect, as to have exalted it, and enriched it with possessions and honours of every kind. For the Jesuits, without parrying the strokes of their enemies by replies and noisy disputation, but by silence for the most part, and patience, have held on their course amid all these storms, and reaching their desired haven, have possessed themselves, with wonderful facility, of their supremacy in the Romish church. The very countries in which the Jesuits were once viewed as horrid monsters and public pests, have, sometimes voluntarily, and sometimes involuntarily, surrendered no small share of their interests and concerns to the discretion and good faith of this most potent fraternity.(99)

§ 29. Literature and the sciences, both the elegant and the solid branches, acquired additional honour and glory in the better provinces of the Romish church. Among the French, the Italians, the Spaniards, and the Catholics of the Low Countries, there were men distinguished for their genius and for their knowledge of various sciences and languages. But we must not ascribe this prosperous state of learning, to the influence of the public schools. For in them, both of the higher and lower orders, that ancient, jejune, tedious, and barren mode of teaching, which obtunds, embarrasses, and perplexes, rather than quickens and strengthens the mind,

and dispersed through numberless writers, by a man of the Jansenist party, who a few years ago undertook to write a history of the order of Jesuits, if he should be permitted to fulfil the promises in his *Preface:* Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus, tome i., Utrecht, 1741, 8vo. And no man was more competent to finish the work commenced by him, than he; unless we are to regard as fabulous, all that he tells us respecting his travels and his sufferings for many years, while exploring the plans, policy, and operations of the Jesuits. But this honest man, imprudently venturing to go into France, was discovered it is said, by his enemies, and assassinated. Hence his work was carried no farther than the third volume. [*Dr. Maclaine*, in his note here, written at the Hague, about the year 1764, says this man was a Frenchman named *Benard;* that he was then living at the Hague; that he had not been massacred in France, but had returned in safety from his visit to that country; that he had never travelled in the manner he pretended in his preface, to collect information, but had collected all his information from books in his study, and had made up the story of his travels to amuse his readers and procure credit to his book; and that no good reason was offered, for his having violated his promise to continue the work. *J. M. Schroeckh*, (in his Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformat., vol. ii., p. 645), tells us, on the authority of a Dutch journal, that the man's name was *Peter Quesnel*, with the surname *Menard;* that he had never travelled as he pretended; that he died at the Hague in the year 1774; and that the report was, he was persuaded, a little before his death, to burn the manuscript of the residue of his work, which was sufficient to fill 20 volumes.—*Tr.*]

(99) Perhaps no people have attacked the Jesuits with more animosity and energy, or done them more harm, than the French. Those who wish to learn what was said and done against them, by the parliament, by the university of Paris, and by the people of France, may consult *Cæsar Egasse de Boulay*, Historia Academiæ Parisiensis, tom. vi., p. 559–648, 676, 738, 742, 744, 763, 774–890, 898, 909; who has scarcely omitted any thing relating to the subject. And what was the issue of all these most vehement contests? The Jesuits, after being ignominiously expelled from France, were first honourably received again, under *Henry* IV. in the year 1604, notwithstanding the indignation of so many men of the greatest reputation and of the highest rank, who were opposed to them. See the Memoires du Duc de Sully; the late edition of Geneva, vol. v., p. 83, &c., 314, &c. In the next place, they were admitted to the government both of the church and of the state; and this felicity they retain quite to our times. [So it was, when *Dr. Mosheim* wrote; but now

> Venit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus
> Dardaniæ, &c.

And even in this France, where the Jesuits were caressed by the great and feared by bishops and archbishops, the conflagration began, which consumed the whole fabric of the Jesuits' universal monarchy.—*Schl.*]

and which loads the memory with a multitude of technical words and phrases, without meaning and without use, has maintained its place quite down to our times. But beyond the limits of these reputed seats of learning, certain great and excellent men guided others to a better and more profitable method of prosecuting study. In this matter, the pre-eminence is justly due to the French; who being prompted by native powers of genius, and encouraged by the munificence of *Lewis* XIV. towards learning and learned men, treated nearly all branches of literature and science in the happiest manner; and rejecting the barbarism of the schools, exhibited learning in a new and elegant dress, suited to captivate the mind.(100) And how greatly the efforts of this very refined nation, tended to rescue the other nations from scholastic bondage, no person of but a moderate share of information, can well be ignorant.

§ 30. No means whatever could remove from the chairs of philosophy those misnamed *Aristotelians*, who were continually quoting *Aristotle*, while they did not in reality understand him. Nor could the court of Rome, which is afraid of every thing new, for a long time, persuade itself to allow the new discoveries of the philosophers to be freely promulged and explained; as is manifest from the sufferings of *Galileo*, a Tuscan mathematician, who was cast into prison for bringing forward the Copernican system of astronomy. Some among the French, led on by *René des Cartes* and *Peter Gassendi*,(101) the former of whom by his doctrines, and the latter in his writings confuted the Peripatetics, first ventured to abandon the thorny fields of the Aristotelians, and to follow more liberal principles of philosophizing. Among these, there were some Jesuits, but a much larger number from among the *Fathers of the Oratory* and the disciples of *Jansenius*, who distinguished themselves. Here will readily occur to many minds, the names of *Malebranche*, *Anthony Arnauld*, *Bernard Lami*, *Peter Nicole*, and *Blaise Pascal;* who acquired lasting fame, by illustrating, perfecting, and adapting to common use the principles of *Des Cartes*.(102) For *Gassendi*, who professed to understand but few things, and who rather taught how to philosophize than proposed a system of philosophy, did not have many followers among a people eager for knowledge, sanguine, ardent, and impatient of protracted labour. Towards the close of the century, some of the Italians as well as other nations, began to imitate the French; at first indeed timidly, but afterwards more confidently, as the pontiffs appeared to relax a little of that jealousy which they had entertained against the new views of the naturalists, mathematicians, and metaphysicians.

§ 31. But it is proper to notice here more distinctly, who were the persons, entitled to the praise of having preserved and advanced both divine

(100) This will be found illustrated by *Voltaire*, in the noted work already quoted repeatedly: Siecle de Louis XIV., and in his *Additions* to that work, [in the edition, Paris, 1820, vol. ii., cap. xxxi.–xxxiv.—*Tr.*]

(101) *Gassendi's* Exercitationes paradoxæ adversus Aristotelicos, is in his Opera, tom. iii., p. 95, &c., and is an accurate and elegant performance, which did great harm to the cause of the Peripatetics. See the remarks already made. [in section i., § 31, of this century, p. 276.—*Tr.*]

(102) The reward which these men had for their labours, was, that they were charged with atheism by the Peripatetics; *John Harduin*, who was intoxicated with the Aristotelico-Scholastic philosophy, being the accuser: Athei Detecti, in his Opera Posthuma, p. 1, &c., and p 259. Nor is the cause of this odium very difficult to be discovered. For the Cartesian philosophy which avoids all darkness and obscurity, is much less efficacious for defending the Romish cause,

and human learning in the Romish church. During a large part of the century, the Jesuits were nearly the only teachers of all branches of learning; and they alone among the monks, were accounted learned men. And the man must be either ignorant or uncandid, who can deny that many renowned and very learned men have highly adorned that society. Lasting as literature itself, will be the merits of *Denys Petau* (*Dionysius Petavius*),(103) *James Sirmond*,(104) *Peter Possin*,(105) *Philip Labbè*,(106) *Nicholas Abrams*,(107) and even of *John Harduin*,(108) though in many things erratic and not of a sound mind; as well as of many others. But as the century advanced, this literary glory of the Jesuits was greatly obscured by the Benedictines, especially by those belonging to the *Congregation of St. Maur*. For while the Jesuits immoderately vaunted of their merits and renown, and were unceasingly censuring the sloth and indolence of the Benedictines, in order to give plausibility to their designs of invading and appropriating to themselves the revenues and the goods of the Benedictines; the latter thought it necessary for them, to wipe off this stain upon their character which they could not deny, and to disarm their harpy enemies, by becoming really meritorious. Hence they not only opened schools in their convents, for instructing youth in all branches of learning, but also appointed select individuals of the best talents, to publish great and imperishable works, which might vindicate the ancient glory and reputation of the Benedictine family against its traducers. This task has been admirably fulfilled, and with a success which baffles description, for about a century past, by such superior men, as *John Mabillon*,(109) *Luke D'Achery* (*Dacherius*),(110) *René Massuet*,(111) *Theodore Ruinart*,(112) *Anthony Beaugendre*,(113) *Julian Garnier*,(114) *Charles de la Rue*,(115)

than the vulgar scholastic philosophy which delights in darkness.

(103) [*Petau*, born in 1583, died 1652; wrote largely on chronology, and the history of religious doctrines; and ably edited several of the fathers, particularly *Epiphanius*. —*Tr.*]

(104) [*Sirmond*, confessor to *Lewis* XIII., died 1651, aged 92; wrote much on church history, and edited several of the fathers. His works were printed, Paris, 1696, 5 vols. fol —*Tr.*]

(105) [*Possin*, born in 1590, and died at Rome near the end of the 17th century; was distinguished as a Hebrew and Greek scholar, and for his editions of the fathers.—*Tr.*]

(106) [*Labbè* of Bourges, died in 1667, aged 60. He was a man of great learning, particularly in church history; but proud and overbearing.—*Tr.*]

(107) [*Abrams*, born 1589, died 1655, was chiefly distinguished for polite learning, and for his comments on *Cicero's* orations, and on *Virgil* —*Tr.*]

(108) [*Harduin*, died at Paris in 1729, aged 83. He was a prodigy of learning; but he maintained, that most of the Greek and Latin classics were forgeries of the monks, in the middle ages. His best work is his Acts of the Councils, in 12 vols. fol.—*Tr.*]

(109) [*Mabillon* was born in 1632, and died at Paris in 1707. He travelled much for literary purposes, in France, Germany, and Italy; and besides publishing the works of *St. Bernard*, and the Lives of sainted Benedictines, (Acta Sanctorum ordinis Benedicti), and his Analecta veterum; he composed Diplomatics, Annals of the Benedictines, and some smaller works.—*Tr.*]

(110) [*D'Achery*, born 1608, died 1685; collected judiciously, and published numerous unprinted writings, pertaining to ecclesiastical history, in 13 vols. 4to. or (2d ed.) in 3 vols. fol., entitled *Spicilegium*, &c.—*Tr.*]

(111) [*Massuet*, born 1665, died 1716; published the best edition of *Irenæus*.—*Tr.*]

(112) [*Ruinart*, born 1657, died 1709; was associated with *Mabillon*, and published Acts of the ancient martyrs, the works of *Gregory* Turonensis, and of *Victor* Vitensis; and some other works.—*Tr.*]

(113) [*Beaugendre* is noted only for the lives of some French bishops, and an edition of the works of *Hildebert*.—*Tr.*]

(114) [*Garnier*, died 1723, aged 53; noted as editor of the works of *St. Basil*, 3 vols. fol.—*Tr.*]

(115) [*De la Rue*, born 1685, died 1739, an associate of *Montfaucon*, and editor of the works of *Origen*, 3 vols. fol. He must

Edmund Martene,(116) *Bernard Montfaucon*,(117) and many others; some of whom have published excellent editions of the Greek and Latin fathers; others have drawn from the obscure shelves of the libraries, those ancient papers and documents which serve to elucidate the history and antiquities of the church; others have explained the ancient events in church and state, the customs and rites of former times, the chronology of the world, and other parts of polite learning; and others have executed other works worthy to be handed down to posterity. I know not how it happened, but from the time these new stars appeared above the literary horizon, the splendour of Jesuit erudition began gradually to decline. For there is no one disposed to deny, that for a long time past, the Jesuits in vain look around among their order to find an individual that may be compared with the Benedictines, who are constantly pursuing strenuously every branch of literature, and publishing almost every year, distinguished monuments of their genius and erudition; nor have the Jesuits for many years published a single work, that can compete with the labours of the Benedictines, unless it be the Acta Sanctorum, now issuing from their press at Antwerp. The rivals of the Benedictines were, the French *Fathers of the Oratory;* many of whom are acknowledged to have laboured successfully in advancing several branches of both human and divine knowledge; which, if there were no other examples, would be manifest from the works of *Charles le Cointe*, author of the imperishable Ecclesiastical Annals of France,(118) and of *John Morin*,(119) *Lewis Thomassin*,(120) and *Richard Simon*.(121) Lastly, the followers of the opinions of *Jansenius*,—or as they would say, of *Augustine*, have published various works, some erudite and others neatly and methodically composed, very useful both to adults and to the young. Who is such a stranger to the literature of that age, as not to have heard of the works of the *Messieurs de Port-Royal*,(122) and of the very elegant

not be confounded with the Jesuit of the same name, who was a poet, and editor of *Virgil* in usum Delphini.—*Tr.*]

(116) [*Martene* died 1739, aged 85; he travelled much to explore monasteries and libraries, and published a Commentary on the Rule of *St. Benedict;* on the ancient monastic rites; a Thesaurus of unpublished works, in 5 vols. fol.; and with *Durand*, a new Thesaurus of the same kind, in 10 vols. fol.; and he and *Durand* were the Benedictine travellers, authors of Voyage litteraire de deux religieux de la Congregation de S. Maur.—*Tr.*]

(117) [*Montfaucon*, born 1655, died 1741, aged 87; a very learned antiquarian, known by his Analecta Græca, 4to; Palæographia Græca, fol.; the works of *Athanasius*, 3 vols. fol.; *Origen's* Hexapla, 2 vols. fol.; *Chrysostom's* works, 13 vols. fol.; Antiquité Expliquée et representée en Figures, 15 vols. fol.; Monumens de la monarchie Françoise, 5 vols. fol.; a Collection of the Greek fathers, 2 vols. fol.; Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum, 2 vols. fol., and some other works.—*Tr.*]

(118) [*Le Cointe*, born 1611, died 1681. His Annales Ecclesiast. Francorum, in 8 vols. fol., extend from A.D. 235, to A.D. 835.—*Tr.*]

(119) [*Morin*, born 1591, educated a Protestant, became a Catholic, and died at Paris 1659. He wrote on the origin of Patriarchs and Primates; on the Samaritan Pentateuch; and published an edition of the Septuagint, 2 vols. fol., and the Samaritan Pentateuch. There were several distinguished men named *Morin*.—*Tr.*]

(120) [*Thomassin*, born 1619, died 1695; published a history of religious doctrines (a feeble imitation of *Denys Petau's* work), in 3 vols. fol., Paris, 1680. *Voltaire* says he was "a man of profound erudition; and first composed Dialogues on the fathers, on Councils, and on History."—*Tr.*]

(121) [*Simon*, born 1638, died 1712; a great critic; wrote Critical History of the O. Test.; the Hist. of Ecclesiastical Revenues, 2 vols. 12mo; Crit. Diss. on *Du Pin's* Biblioth. des auteurs eccles.; Crit. Hist. of the N. Test., and various other works.—*Tr.*]

(122) By this title are designated all the Jansenist writers; but especially, and in a stricter sense, those who spent their lives in literary and devotional pursuits in the retired

and useful productions of *Tillemont*,(123) *Arnauld*,(124) *Nicole*,(125) *Pascal*,(126) *Lancelot*,(127) and others? The other religious orders, as well as the bishops and inferior clergy in the Romish church, had also their great men. For it would be strange, if in such a multitude of men enjoying much leisure and all advantages for study, there should not be some successful scholars. Yet all who acquired fame and merited distinction as learned men and authors, out of those four orders just mentioned, would collectively scarcely form so large a body, as any one of those orders alone can exhibit.

§ 32. Hence a copious list might be drawn up, of learned men in the Romish church, whose works composed with great care and diligence, live since they are dead. Of the monastic families and of the priests that were bound to regular rules of living, the most distinguished were, *Cæsar Baronius*,(128) and *Robert Bellarmine*,(129) both cardinals, and both extremely useful to their church, the first by his elaborate *Annals* and the latter by his controversial writings; also *Nicholas Serrarius*,(130) *Francis Feuardentius*,(131) *Anthony Possevin*,(132) *James Gretzer*,(133) *Francis Combefis*,(134) *Natalis Alexander* (*Alexander Noel*),(135) *Martin Becan*,(136)

situation of *Port-Royal*, not far from Paris. Among these, it is generally known, there were great men, who possessed first-rate talents and were very finished writers.

(123) [*Sebastian le Nain de Tillemont*, born at Paris 1637, died 1698, refused a bishopric, and wrote Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire ecclesiast. de six premiers siecles, Paris, 1693, &c., 16 vols. 4to; and Histoire des Empereurs et auteurs Princes, jusqû à l'Empereur Honorius.—*Tr.*]

(124) [*Anthony Arnauld*, or *Arnaud*, was born at Paris in 1612, and died at Liege 1694. He wrote on grammar, logic, and geometry; and polemic pieces against the Jesuits and the Calvinists, on moral subjects; and is supposed to have contributed No. 3, 9, 12, 13, 14, and 15, to the Provincial Letters.—*Tr.*]

(125) [*Peter Nicole*, born 1625, died at Paris 1695. Besides controversial pieces against the Jesuits, and aiding *Arnaud* in some works, he wrote Essays de Moral, 13 vols. 12mo; on the perpetuity of the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, 3 vols.; Prejugés legitimes contre les Calvinistes; and translated the Provincial Letters into Latin, with large notes, under the fictitious name of *William Wendrock*.—*Tr*]

(126) [*Blaise Pascal*, born at Clermont 1623, died 1662. Besides his Pensées, and some treatises on Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, he composed the famous Lettres à un Provincial. His works were printed 5 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1799.—*Tr.*]

(127) [*Claude Lancelot*, born 1616, died 1695; taught Greek and the mathematics at Port-Royal; and had a hand in the schoolbooks there published.—*Tr.*]

(128) [*Baronius*, born at Sora in Naples 1538, second general of the Italian order of Fathers of the Oratory, confessor to pope *Clement* VIII., cardinal, and librarian of the Vatican; he wrote Annales Ecclesiastici, 12 vols. fol., Rome, 1588-1607; was candidate for the papal chair in 1605; and died in 1607.—*Tr.*]

(129) [*Bellarmine*, a Florentine, born in 1542, cardinal in 1599, died in 1621. He wrote Opus Controversiarum, 3 vols. fol., de Potestate summi Pontificis, a Commentary on the Psalms, and an account of the ecclesiastical writers. He was learned, and a giant reasoner, though in a bad cause.—*Tr.*]

(130) [*Serrarius*, of Lorrain, a Jesuit, died at Mayence in 1610, aged 65; a voluminous commentator on the Bible. His works fill 16 vols fol.—*Tr.*]

(131) [*Feuardent*, of Normandy, a Franciscan, born 1541, died 1641; edited *Irenæus*; wrote and preached furiously against the Protestants.—*Tr.*]

(132) [*Possevin* was a Jesuit of Mantua, born 1533, died 1611. He was papal legate to Poland, Sweden, Germany, &c. He wrote Bibliotheca selecta de ratione studiorum, 2 vols. fol.; Apparatus Sacer, 2 vols. fol., and some other things —*Tr*]

(133) [*Gretzer*, a German Jesuit, born 1561, professor of theology at Ingolstadt; died 1636. He wrote much against the Protestants. His works fill 17 vols. fol.—*Tr.*]

(134) [*Combefis*, a Dominican of Guienne, died 1679. A fine Greek scholar, and editor of several Greek fathers, and of five Greek historians —*Tr.*]

(135) [*Natalis Alexander*, a Dominican of Rouen, died in 1724, aged 86. He wrote

James Sirmond, Dionysius Petavius, Peter Possin, Lewis Cellot,(137) *Nicholas Caussin,*(138) *John Morin, Theophilus Raynard (Raynaudus),*(139) *Paul Sarpi,*(140) *Sfortia Pallavicini,*(141) *Philip Labbé, Lewis Maimbourg,*(142) *Lewis Thomassin, Cœlestine Sfondrati,*(143) *Jos. Aguirre,*(144) *Henry Noris,*(145) *Luke D'Achery, John Mabillon, John Harduin, Richard Simon, Theodore Ruinart, Bernard de Montfaucon, Anthony Gallon,*(146) *Fortunatus Scacchi,*(147) *Cornelius à Lapide,*(148) *James Bonfrere,*(149) *Hugh Menard,*(150) *Claude Seguenot,*(151) *Bernard Lami,*(152) *John Bolland,*(153) *Godfrey Henschenius,*(154) *Daniel Papebroch,*(155)

Historiæ Eccles. Vet. et Novi Test. selecta Capita, in 30 vols. 8vo, 8 vols. fol., and 18 vols. 4to; also a System of Theology, 2 vols. fol. His Eccles. History is candid and learned, but written in a dry and argumentative manner.—*Tr.*]

(136) [*Becan*, a Jesuit of Brabant, confessor to *Ferdinand* II., died at Vienna in 1624. He wrote much against the Protestants, and a Sum of Theology, in French.—*Tr.*]

(137) [*Cellot*, a Jesuit of Paris, died 1658. He wrote the Hist. of *Gottschalk*, and published the Opusc. of *Hincmar* of Rheims.—*Tr.*]

(138) [*Caussinus*, a French Jesuit, died 1651, aged 71. He was confessor to *Louis* XIII., and wrote de sacra et profana eloquentia, and some other things.—*Tr.*]

(139) [*Raynard*, an Italian Jesuit, died at Lyons, 1663, aged 80. He edited several of the fathers, and wrote Tables for sacred and profane history. His works were printed at Lyons, 1665, in 20 vols. fol.—*Tr.*]

(140) [*Sarpi*, a Venetian monk of the order of Servites, born 1552, died 1623; a celebrated defender of the religious liberties of his country against the pontiff. He wrote a History of the Council of Trent, fol.; a History of Benefices; and various tracts in defence of his country, which fill 6 vols. 12mo, Venice, 1677.—*Tr.*]

(141) [*Pallavicini*, a Romish Jesuit and cardinal, born at Rome 1607, died 1667. He wrote, in Italian, a History of the Council of Trent, opposed to that of *Sarpi*, Rome, 1656, 2 vols. fol., translated into Latin, Antw., 1673, 2 vols. fol.; also a treatise on style, &c.—*Tr.*]

(142) [*Maimbourg*, a French Jesuit of Nancy, born 1610, died 1686, noted as a preacher, but more as a historian. His Histoire du Lutheranisme, was refuted by *Seckendorf;* his Hist. du Calvinisme, by *Jurieu* and by *Jo Bapt. de Rocoles*. He also wrote Histories of Arianism, of the Iconoclasts, of the Crusades, of the schism of the Greeks, of the schism of the West, of the decay of the Empire, of the League, of the pontificate of *Leo* the Great. He is a sprightly writer, but a partial historian.—*Tr.*]

(143) [*Sfondrati*, a Benedictine abbot of St. Gall, and a cardinal, died at Rome 1696, aged 53. He wrote Gallia Vindicata, and Nodus prædestinationis dissolutus, 4to.—*Tr.*

(144) [*Aguirre*, a Spanish Benedictine, professor at Salamanca, defended the papal supremacy against the French, was made a cardinal, published Collectio maxima Conciliorum omnium Hispan. et novi orbis, &c., 6 vols. fol., and died at Rome 1669, aged 69.—*Tr.*]

(145) [*Noris*, an Augustinian monk, born at Verona 1631, of Irish parentage, professor of Eccl. Hist. at Pisa, librarian of the Vatican, a cardinal in 1695, and died at Rome in 1704. He wrote a Hist. of Pelagianism, History of Investitures, and various other learned works, printed collectively, Verona, 1729, 1730, 5 vols. fol.—*Tr.*]

(146) [*Gallonio*, a Romish presbyter of the Oratory, died 1605. He wrote de cruciatibus Martyrum, with plates, 1594, 4to, and some other things.—*Tr.*]

(147) [*Scacchi* was an Italian Augustinian Eremite, who corrected the Romish Martyrol. and Breviary, and died in 1640.—*Tr.*]

(148) [*A Lapide* was a Jesuit of Liege, who wrote Commentaries on the Bible, 10 vols. fol., and died at Rome 1637, aged 71.—*Tr.*]

(149) [*Bonfrere* was a Jesuit, professor at Douay, wrote Commentaries on the Pentateuch, on scripture names, &c., and died at Tournay, 1643, aged 70.—*Tr.*]

(150) [*Menard* was a Benedictine of St. Maur, born at Paris in 1587, and died in 1644. He wrote Diatribe de unico Dionysio, and Martyrolog. ex ord. Benedict.—*Tr.*]

(151) [*Seguenot* was a French priest of the Oratory, wrote notes on the French translation of *Augustine* de Virginitate, which excited commotion; and died in 1644.—*Tr.*]

(152) [*Lami* was also a French priest of the Oratory, born in 1645, and died in 1715. He wrote on geometry, on the sciences, on perspective, on Christian Morality, 5 vols. 12mo, Apparatus Biblicus, 4to, de Tabernaculo, fol., Harmonia Evangelica, 2 vols. 4to, &c.—*Tr.*]

(153) [*Bolland*, a Jesuit of Tillemont in Flanders, who commenced the Acta Sanc-

and many others. Of the other clergy, or those not of any religious order but *secular clergymen*, as they are called in distinction from the *regular* clergy, the following acquired distinction and fame by their writings; viz., *James David Perron*,(156) *William Est* (*Estius*),(157) *John Launoi*,(158) *Gabriel Aubespine* (*Albaspinius*),(159) *Peter de Marca*,(160) *John Armand Richelieu*,(161) *Luke Holstein*,(162) *Stephen Baluze*,(163) *John Bona*,(164) *Peter Daniel Huet*,(165) *James Benignus Bossuet*,(166) *Francis Fenelon*,(167) *Anthony Godeau*,(168) *Sebastian le Nain de Tillemont*, *John Baptist Thiers*,(169) *Louis Ellies du Pin*,(170) *Leo Allatius*,(171)

torum, of which he published 6 vols. fol., and died in 1665.—*Tr.*]

(154) [*Henschen*, a Jesuit of Antwerp, continuator of the Acta Sanctorum, died 1682.—*Tr.*]

(155) [*Papebroch*, a Jesuit of Antwerp, also a continuator of the Acta Sanctorum, died in 1714.—*Tr.*]

(156) [*Perron*, born a French Protestant 1556, turned Catholic, became bishop of Evreux, abp. of Sens, almoner of France, and in 1604, a cardinal. He was very learned and eloquent, and a great reasoner; wrote on the Eucharist, against *Du Plessis Mornay*, &c., and died at Paris in 1618, aged 63. His works fill 3 vols. fol.—*Tr.*]

(157) [*Estius*, born at Gorcum in Holland, was divinity professor and chancellor of the university of Douay, where he died in 1613, aged 71. He wrote Commentaries on the Epistles, 2 vols. fol., Annotations on difficult passages of Scripture, fol., and the martyrdom of *Edmund Campian*.—*Tr.*]

(158) [*Launoi*, a doctor of theology at Paris, born in 1603, and died in 1678. He was a strenuous defender of the liberties of the Gallic church, a strong opposer of legends, and a learned critic. His works were printed at Geneva in 10 vols. fol.—*Tr.*]

(159) [*Aubespine*, bishop of Orleans, died 1630, aged 52. He was learned in ecclesiastical antiquities; and commented on the fathers and councils.—*Tr.*]

(160) [*De Marca* was born at Gart in Bearne, 1594, first studied law, married and became a counsellor; afterwards devoted himself to theology, was bishop of Conserans, archbishop of Toulouse, and lastly of Paris, where he died in 1662. This great man wrote a History of Bearne, and de Concordia Imperii et Sacerdotii.—*Tr.*]

(161) [*Richelieu*, born 1585, died 1642, a cardinal, peer, and prime minister; persecuted the French Protestants; and wrote a defence of the Catholic faith against the Protestants; a tract on the best method of confuting heretics; and several other things.—*Tr.*]

(162) [*Holstein*. See note (62), p. 301. He was a critic and editor, and wrote de Abassinorum communione sub unica specie; on the Sacrament of Confirmation among the Greeks; on the Nicene Council, &c.—*Tr.*]

(163) [*Baluze*, professor of canon law at Paris, died 1718, aged 87. He wrote Lives of the Popes of Avignon; and was a noted editor.—*Tr.*]

(164) [*Bona*, born in Piedmont 1609, died at Rome 1674, a cardinal. He wrote Manuductio ad cœlum; Principia vitæ Christianæ; Via compendii ad Deum; de Sacrificio Missæ; de Discretione Spirituum; de Rebus Liturgicis lib. ii.; de Divina Psalmodia; Testamentum; and Horologium Asceticum. He was a very devout man.—*Tr.*]

(165) [*Huet*, born in Caen 1630, bishop of Soissons, and of Avranches, died 1721. He was very learned, and wrote de Interpretatione, lib. ii.; Origeniana; Demonstratio Evangelica; Censura philosophiæ Cartesianæ; Questiones Alnetanæ de concordia rationis et fidei; and several other things.—*Tr.*]

(166) [*Bossuet*, born at Dijon 1627, bishop of Meaux, counsellor of state, died 1704. This elegant writer composed a Discourse on Universal History; History of the variations among Protestant Churches; Funeral Orations; Exposition of the Catholic Faith, Disputes with *Fenelon*, &c., collected, Paris, 1743, in 12 vols. 4to.—*Tr.*]

(167) [*Fenelon*, archbishop of Cambray, born 1651, died 1715. He wrote Explication des Maximes des Saintes sur la Vie interieure, in which he supported the views of Madam *Guyon*, and thus involved himself in controversy with *Bossuet*, and incurred censure from the pope; also Telemachus; Dialogues of the Dead; Dialogues on Eloquence; Demonstration of the existence of God; Spiritual Works; and many other pieces; in all, 10 vols. 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(168) [*Godeau*, born at Dreux, 1605, died 1671, bishop of Venice. He wrote some commentaries on the scriptures, and an Eccles. Hist., 3 vols. fol. 1653.—*Tr.*]

(169) [*Thiers*, born at Chartres, 1641, died 1703; professor of Belles Lettres at Paris, and then curate of Vivray in Le Mans. He wrote on Superstitions; concerning the Sacraments; on Fast Days; History of Pe-

Lawrence Alexander Zaccagni,(172) *John Baptist Cotelier*,(173) *John Filesac*,(174) *Joseph Visconti*,(175) and others.(176) This list might be greatly enlarged, by adding the names of such laymen, either in public or private life, as did service to sacred and secular learning.

§ 33. That the public religion of the Romish church, both as to articles of faith and rules of practice, was not purified in this century and made conformable to the only standard, the sacred scriptures, but was here and there corrupted and deformed, either by the negligence of the popes or the zeal of the Jesuits; is the complaint, not so much of those who are opposed to this church, or those called *heretics*, as of all those members of it who favour solid and correct knowledge of religion and genuine piety. As to doctrines of faith, it is said that the Jesuits with the connivance, nay frequently with the assistance of the Romish prelates, entirely subverted such of the first principles of Christianity, as the council of Trent had left untouched: for they lowered the dignity and utility of the sacred scriptures, extolled immoderately the power of man to do good, extenuated the efficacy and necessity of divine grace, detracted from the greatness of Christ's merits, almost equalled the Roman pontiff to our Saviour, and converted him into a terrestrial deity, and in fine, brought the truth of Christianity itself into immense danger, by their fallacious and sophistical reasonings. It is difficult to gainsay the abundant testimony, by which the gravest men particularly among the Jansenists, support these accusations. But it is easy to show, that the Jesuits were not inventors of the doctrines they inculcated; but in reality, taught and explained that old form of the Romish religion, which was every where taught before *Luther's* time, and by which the authority, wealth, and power of the pontiffs and the church had grown during many centuries to their immense height. The Jesuits would teach otherwise, if the pontiffs wished them to use all their efforts to render the church more holy and more like Christ; but they cannot teach otherwise, so long as they are instructed to make it their first care, that the pontiffs may hold what they have got, and recover what they have lost, and that the prelates and ministers of the church may continually become more rich and more powerful. If the Jesuits committed any error

rukes; the crucifixion of *St. Francis*, &c.—*Tr.*]

(170) [*Du Pin*, a doctor of the Sorbonne, born at Paris 1657, died there 1719, aged 62. He wrote Bibliotheque universelle des Auteurs Ecclesiast., in 19 vols. 4to, down to A.D. 1600.; Prolegomena to the Bible; Notes on the Psalms and the Pentateuch; de antiqua Ecclesiæ Disciplina; a Method of studying Divinity; and edited the works of *Optatus* Milevit. and of *Gerson*.—*Tr.*]

(171) [*Allatius* or *Allazzi*, born at Scio in the Ægean Sea, educated at Rome, teacher in the Greek college there, librarian of the Vatican, died at Rome 1669, aged 83. Besides editing various Greek works, he wrote de Perpetua Consensu Ecclesiæ Gr. et Lat.; and some other works.—*Tr.*]

(172) [*Zaccagni*, keeper of the Vatican library, died at Rome in 1712. He published Collectanea monumentor. vet. ecclesiæ Gr. et Lat. 1698.—*Tr.*]

(173) [*Cotelier*, born at Nismes 1627, died at Paris 1686, aged 59. He was professor of Greek at Paris, and published the Patres Apostolici, 1672, 2 vols. fol.; and Mon. Eccles. Græcæ, 3 vols. fol.—*Tr.*]

(174) [*Filesac*, doctor of the Sorbonne, and dean of the faculty of theology at Paris, died in 1638. His works were printed in 1621, 3 vols. 4to. The best is, Notes on *Vincentius* Lirinensis.—*Tr.*]

(175) [*Visconti*, or *Vicecomes*, professor of Eccles. antiquities at Milan. He wrote de Antiquis Baptismi Ritibus; and de Ritibus Confirmationis et Missæ.—*Tr.*]

(176) Whoever wishes to know more of the merits of these writers, may consult, besides the common authors of literary history, *Du Pin's* volumes concerning the ecclesiastical writers, vol. xvii., xviii., xix.

in this matter, it consisted wholly in this, that they explained more clearly and lucidly, what the fathers at Trent either left imperfectly explained or wholly passed over, lest they should shock the minds of the persons of better sentiments who attended that celebrated convention. Hence also the pontiffs, though pressed by the strongest arguments and exhortations, could never be persuaded to pass any severe censures upon the religious sentiments of the Jesuits; and on the other hand have resisted, sometimes secretly, and sometimes openly, such as opposed their doctrines with more than ordinary spirit and energy; for they looked upon such, as being indiscreet persons, who either did not or would not know what the interests of the church required.

§ 34. That morality was not so much corrupted and vitiated in nearly all its parts, as subverted altogether by the Jesuits, is the public complaint of innumerable writers of every class, and of very respectable fraternities, in the Romish church. Nor does their complaint seem groundless, since they adduce from the books of the Jesuits professedly treating of the right mode of living, and especially from the writings of those called *Casuists*, many principles which are opposed to all virtue and honesty. In particular they show, that these men teach the following doctrines: That a bad man who is an entire stranger to the love of God, provided he feels some fear of the divine wrath, and from dread of punishment avoids grosser crimes, is a fit candidate for eternal salvation: That men may sin with safety, provided they have a probable reason for the sin; i. e., some argument or authority in favour of it: That actions in themselves wrong and contrary to the divine law, are allowable, provided a person can control his own mind, and in his thoughts connect a good *end* with the criminal deed; or as they express it, knows how *to direct his intention right:* That *philosophical sins*, that is, actions which are contrary to the law of nature and to right reason, in a person ignorant of the written law of God or dubious as to its true meaning, are light offences, and do not deserve the punishments of hell: That the deeds a man commits, when wholly blinded by his lusts and the paroxysms of passion, and when destitute of all sense of religion, though they be of the vilest and most execrable character, can by no means be charged to his account in the judgment of God; because such a man is like a madman: That it is right for a man, when taking an oath or forming a contract, in order to deceive the judge and subvert the validity of the covenant or oath, tacitly to add something to the words of the compact or the oath: and other sentiments of the like nature.(177) These

(177) One might make up a whole library of books, exposing and censuring the corrupt moral principles of the Jesuits. The best work on the subject, is the very elegant and ingenious production of *Blaise Pascal*, entitled: Les Provinciales, ou Lettres écrites par Louis de Montalte à un Provincial des ses amis, et aux Jesuites, sur la Morale et la Politique de ces peres, 2 tomes 8vo. *Peter Nicole*, under the fictitious name of *William Wendrock*, added to it learned and judicious notes, in which he copiously demonstrates the truth of what *Pascal* had stated either summarily or without giving authorities. It was also translated into Latin, by *Samuel Rachels*. [An English translation of the Provincial Letters, was published in 1828, by *J. Leavitt*, New-York, and *Crocker* and *Brewster*, Boston, 319 pages, 12mo.—*Tr.*] Against this terrible adversary, the Jesuits sent forth their best geniuses, and among others the very eloquent and acute *Gabriel Daniel*, the celebrated author of the History of France; they also caused *Pascal's* book to be publicly burned at Paris. See *Daniel's* Opuscula, vol. i., p 363, who himself admits, that most of the answers to the book by the Jesuits, were unsatisfactory. But whether *Pascal* prevailed by the force and solidity of his arguments, or by the

and other doctrines, not only the Dominicans and Jansenists but also the divines of Paris, Poictiers, Louvain, and others in great numbers, so pointedly condemned in public, that *Alexander* VII. thought proper to condemn some part of them, in his decree of the 21st of August, 1659; and *Alexander* VIII., on the 24th of August, 1690, condemned particularly the philosophical sin of the Jesuits.(178) But these numerous and respectable decisions and decrees against the moral principles of the Jesuits, if we may believe the common voice of learned and pious men, were more efficacious in restraining the horrid licentiousness of the writers of this society, than in purging their schools of these abominable principles. And the reason assigned, why so many kings and princes and persons of every rank and sex, committed the care of their souls to the Jesuits especially, is, that such confessors by their precepts, extenuated the guilt of sin, flattered the criminal passions of men, and opened an easy and convenient way to heaven.(179)

sweetness and elegance of his style and satire, it is certain that all these answers detracted very little from the reputation of his Letters; and edition after edition of them continued to be published. Less attractive in form but more solid, from the multitude of testimonies and citations from the approved Jesuitical writers, was, La Morale des Jesuites extraite fidellement de leurs livres imprimez avec la permission et l'approbation des Superieurs de leur Compagnie, par un Docteur de Sorbonne; in 3 vols. 8vo, Mons, 1702. This book also (which was written by *Perault*, brother of that *Charles Perault* who began the famous dispute, whether the moderns were inferior or superior to the ancients), was burned at Paris in 1670, through the instigation of the Jesuits. Œuvres du *P. Daniel*, tome i., p. 356, &c. And there was good reason; for whoever shall read this single book, will there see all the faults that were charged upon the Jesuitical writers on morals. That the Jesuits actually put their moral principles in practice, especially in foreign and remote countries, *Anthony Arnauld* with his Jansenist associates, undertook to prove in an elaborate work entitled: La Morale Pratique des Jesuites; which gradually appeared, during the last century, in eight volumes; and, when copies of it became scarce, it was republished, Amsterdam, 1742, 8 vols. 8vo, with numerous additional proofs of the charges against the Jesuits. Respecting philosophical sin in particular, and the commotions that arose from it, see *James Hyacinth Serry*, (or rather *Augustus le Blanc*), in his Addenda ad Historiam Congregationum de auxiliis, p. 82, &c., and in his Auctarium to these Addenda, p. 289, &c.

(178) The history of the commotions in France and in other places, arising from these opinions of the Jesuits respecting morality, was neatly drawn up, by the writer of the Catéchisme Historique et Dogmatique sur les contestations qui divisent maintenant l'Eglise; 1730, 8vo, vol. ii., p. 26, &c. The *Bulls* here mentioned, are sought for in vain in the Bullarium Pontificum. But the care of the Dominicans and Jansenists to preserve every thing disreputable to Jesuits, would not suffer them to be lost.

(179) What is here said of the very gross errors of the Jesuits, should not be understood to imply, that all the members of this society cherish these opinions; or that the public schools of the order echo with them. For this fraternity embraces very many persons, who are both learned and ingenuous, and by no means bad men. Nor would it be difficult to fill several volumes with citations from the writings of Jesuits, in which a much purer virtue and piety are taught, than that black and deformed system which *Pascal* and the others present to us from the *Casuists*, *Summists*, and *Moralists* of this order. Those who accuse the Jesuits as a body, if candid, can mean only that the leaders of the society both permit such impious sentiments to be publicly set forth by individuals, and give their approbation and countenance to the books in which such sentiments are taught; that the system of religion, which is taught here and there in their schools, is so lax and disjointed, that it easily leads men to such pernicious conclusions; and finally, that the small select number, who are initiated in the greater mysteries of the order, and who are employed in public stations and in guiding the minds of the great, commonly make use of such principles to advance the interests and augment the wealth of the society. I would also acknowledge, since ingenuousness is the prime virtue of a historian, that in exaggerating the turpitude of some Jesuitical opinions, some of their

§ 35. The holy scriptures were so far from receiving more reverence and authority from the pontiffs, that on the contrary in most countries the friends of the papal cause and especially the Jesuits, as appears from the best evidence, took great pains to keep them out of the hands of the people, or from being interpreted differently from what the convenience of the church required. Among the French and the Belgians, there were some who might not improperly be denominated learned and intelligent expositors; but the majority of those who pretended to expound the sacred writings, rather obscured and darkened the divine oracles by their comments than elucidated them. And in this class must be placed, even the Jansenists; who, though they treated the Bible with more respect than the other Catholics, yet strangely adulterated the word of God, by the frigid allegories and recondite expositions of the ancient doctors.(180) Yet we ought to except *Paschasius Quesnel*, a father of the Oratory, who published the *New Testament*, illustrated with pious meditations and observations, which has in our day been the prolific cause of so many disputes, commotions, and divisions.(181)

§ 36. Nearly all the schools retained the old method of teaching theology; which was dry, thorny, and by no means suited to men of liberal minds. Not even the decrees of the pontiffs, could bring *dogmatic* or *biblical theology* to be in equal estimation with *scholastic*. For most of the chairs were occupied by the *Scholastic* doctors, and they perplexed and depressed the *biblical* divines, who were in general not well acquainted with the arts of wrangling. The *Mystics* were wholly excluded from the schools; and, unless they were very cautious and submissive to the church, could scarcely escape the brand of heresy. Yet many of the French, and among them, the followers of *Jansenius* especially, explained the principal

adversaries have been over eloquent and vehement; as might easily be shown if there were opportunity, in regard to the doctrines of *probability*, *mental reservation in oaths*, and some others. For in this as in most other disputes and controversies, respecting either sacred or secular subjects, the accused were charged with the consequences, which their accusers deduced from their declarations, their words were made to express more than they intended, and the limitations they contemplated to their opinions, were overlooked.

(180) Very well known, even among us, is the *Bible* of *Isaac le Maitre*, commonly called *Sacy*; which comprehends nearly every thing, with which the heated imaginations of the ancient doctors disfigured the simplest narrations and the clearest statements of the sacred volume. [It is also called the Translation of Mons, because it was first printed there, in 1665. It was commenced by *Sacy*, a very zealous Jansenist who died in 1664, and completed by *Thomas du Fossé*. It is founded on the Vulgate; yet here and there deviates from it. The archbishop of Paris, *Perefix*, soon after it appeared, in 1667, published a severe circular, forbidding it to be read. The same thing was done by *Gc. Aubusson*, bishop of Embrun: the Jesuits also did not remain idle: and at last, in 1668, *Clement* IX. condemned it, as a perverse and dangerous translation, that deviated from the Vulgate, and was a stone of stumbling to the simple. This censure, it by no means merited: and even *Mosheim's* censure is applicable only to the notes, which are taken chiefly from the fathers, and are very mystical.—*Schl.*]

(181) The first part, containing notes on the four Gospels, was published in 1671: and being received with great applause, it was republished, enlarged and amended, together with notes on the other books of the New Testament. See Catechisme Historique sur les Contestationes de l'Eglise, tome ii., p. 150. *Christ. Eberh. Weismann's* Historia Eccles., sæcul. xvii., p. 588, &c., and numerous others. [*Quesnel*, in his translation, followed that of *Sacy*; though to avoid all offence, he kept closer to the Vulgate. Most of the notes relate entirely to practical religion. The contests produced by the work, belong to the history of the eighteenth century.—*Schl.*]

doctrines of Christianity in a neat and lucid style. In like manner, nearly all that was written judiciously and elegantly respecting piety and morality, came from the pens either of the *Messieurs de Port-Royal* as the Jansenists were usually called, or from the French *Fathers of the Oratory*. Of the change in the manner of conducting theological controversies, we have already spoken. The Germans, the Belgians, and the French, having learned to their disadvantage that the angry, loose, and captious mode of disputing, which their fathers pursued, rather confirmed than weakened the faith and resolution of dissentients; and that the arguments on which their doctors formerly placed much reliance, had lost nearly all their force; thought it necessary for them to look out for new methods of warfare, and those apparently more wise.

§ 37. The minor controversies of the schools and of the religious orders, which divided the Romish church, we shall pass over: for the pontiffs for the most part disregard them; or if at any time they become too violent, a nod or a mandate from the pope easily suppresses them: neither are these skirmishes, which perpetually exist, of such a nature as seriously to endanger the welfare of the church. It will be sufficient to recite briefly those controversies, which affected seriously the whole church. Among these, the first place is due to the contests between the Dominicans and the Jesuits, respecting the nature of divine grace and its necessity to salvation; the cognizance of which, *Clement* VIII., at the close of the preceding century, had committed to some selected theologians.(182) These, after some years of consultation and attention to the arguments of the parties, signified to the pontiff not obscurely, that the doctrines of the Dominicans respecting grace, predestination, man's ability to do good, and the inherent corruption of our natures, were more consonant with the holy scriptures and the opinions of the fathers, than the opinions of *Molina*, whom the Jesuits supported: that the former accorded with the sentiments of *Augustine*, and the latter approximated to those of *Pelagius*, which had been condemned. Therefore in the year 1601, *Clement* seemed ready to pronounce sentence against the Jesuits, and in favour of the Dominicans. But the Jesuits perceiving their cause to be in such imminent peril, so besieged the aged pontiff, sometimes with threats, sometimes with complaints, and now with arguments, that in the year 1602 he resolved to give the whole of this knotty controversy a rehearing, and to assume to himself the office of presiding judge. The pontiff therefore presided over this trial during three years, or from the 20th of March, 1602, till the 22d of January, 1605, having for assessors fifteen cardinals, nine theologians, and five bishops; and he held seventy-eight sessions, or *Congregations* as they are denominated at Rome;(183) in which he patiently listened to the arguments of the Jesuits and the Dominicans, and caused their arguments to be carefully weighed and examined. To what results he came, is uncertain: for he was cut off by death, on the 4th of March, 1605, when just ready to pronounce sentence. If we may believe the Dominicans, he was prepared to condemn *Molina*, in a public decree; but if we believe the Jesuits, he would have acquitted him of all error. Which of them is to be believed, no one can determine, without inspecting the records of the trial, which are kept most carefully concealed at Rome.

(182) [See the preceding century, sect. iii., ch. i., § 40, 41, p. 110, &c.—*Tr.*]

(183) [*Congregationes de auxiliis, ss. gratiæ;* in the Romish style.—*Tr.*]

§ 38. *Paul* V. the successor of *Clement*, ordered the judges in the month of September, 1605, to resume their inquiries and deliberations which had been suspended. They obeyed his mandate, and had frequent discussions until the month of March in the next year; debating not so much on the merits of the question, which had been sufficiently examined, as on the mode of terminating the contest. For it was debated, whether it would be for the interests of the church to have this dispute decided by a public decree of the pontiff; and if it were, then what should be the form and phraseology of the decree. The issue of this protracted business was, that the whole contest came to nothing, as is frequent at Rome; that is, it was decided neither way, but each party was left free to retain its own sentiments. The Dominicans maintain, that *Paul* V. and the theologians to whom he committed the investigation, equally with *Clement* before him, perceived the holiness and justice of *their* cause; and they tell us, that a severe decree against the doctrines of the Jesuits was actually drawn up, and sealed by his order; but that the unhappy war with the Venetians, which broke out at that time, and of which we have already given an account, prevented the publication of the decree. On the contrary, the Jesuits contend, that all this is false; and that the pontiff with the wisest of the theologians, after examining the whole cause, judged the sentiments of *Molina* to contain nothing which much needed correction. It is far more probable that *Paul* was deterred from passing sentence, by fear of the kings of France and Spain; of whom the former patronised the cause of the Jesuits, and the latter that of the Dominicans. And if he had published a decision, it would undoubtedly have been not unlike those usually promulged at Rome, that is, ambiguous, and not wholly adverse to either of the contending parties.(184)

(184) The writers already quoted on this subject, may be consulted here. Also *Jo. le Clerc*, Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Controverses dans l'Eglise Romaine sur la prédestination et sur la grace; in the Bibliotheque Universelle et Historique, tome xiv., p. 234, &c. The conduct both of the Jesuits and the Dominicans after this controversy was put to rest, affords grounds for a suspicion, that both parties were privately admonished by the pontiff, to temper and regulate in some measure their respective doctrines, so that the former might no longer be taxed with Pelagianism, nor the latter with coinciding with the Calvinists. For *Claudius Aquaviva*, the general of the order of Jesuits, in a circular letter addressed to the whole fraternity, Dec. 14th, 1613, very cautiously modifies the doctrine of *Molina*; and commands his brethren to teach every where, that God gratuitously, and without any regard to their merits, from all eternity, elected those to salvation, whom he wished should be partakers of it: yet they must so teach this, as by no means to give up what the Jesuits had maintained in their disputes with the Dominicans, respecting the nature of divine grace: and these two things, which seem to clash with each other, he thinks may be conveniently reconciled, by means of that divine knowledge which is called *scientia media*, [foreknowledge of the free actions of men]. See Catechisme Historique sur les dissensions de l'Eglise, tome i., p. 207. On the contrary the Dominicans, though holding substantially the same sentiments as before this controversy arose, yet greatly obscured and disfigured their sentiments, by using words and distinctions borrowed from the schools of the Jesuits; so that not even a Jesuit can now tax them with having the mark of Calvinism. They are also much more slow to oppose the Jesuits; recollecting, doubtless, their former perils, and their immense labours undertaken in vain. This change of conduct, the Jansenists severely charge upon them, as being a manifest and great defection from divine truth. See *Blaise Pascal's* Lettres Provinciales, tome i., lettr. ii., p. 27, &c. Yet their ill-will against the Jesuits, is by no means laid aside; nor can the Dominicans (among whom many are greatly dissatisfied with the cautious prudence of their order) easily keep themselves quiet, whenever a good opportunity occurs for exercising their resentments. With the Dominicans in this cause at least, the Augustinians are in har-

§ 39. The wounds which seemed thus healed, were again torn open to the great damage of the Catholic interest, when the book of *Cornelius Jansenius*, bishop of Ypres in the Netherlands, was published after his death, in 1640, under the title of *Augustinus*.(185) In this book, (the author of which is allowed even by the Jesuits to have been a learned and solid man, and apparently at least devout), the opinions of *Augustine* respecting the native depravity of man, and the nature and influence of that grace by which alone this depravity can be cured, are stated and explained; and for the most part, in the very words of *Augustine*. For it was not the object of *Jansenius*, as he tells us himself, to show what ought to be believed on these subjects, but merely what *Augustine* believed.(186) But as the doctrine of *Augustine*, (which differed little from that of *St. Thomas* [*Aquinas*] which was embraced by the Dominicans), was accounted almost sacred and divine in the Romish church, on account of the high character and merits of its author, and at the same time was almost diametrically opposite to the common sentiments of the Jesuits; this work of *Jansenius* could not but appear to them, as a silent, yet most effectual confutation of their sentiments. Hence they not only attacked it with their own writings, but they instigated the pontiff *Urban* VIII. to condemn it. Nor were their efforts unsuccessful. First, the inquisitors at Rome in 1641, prohibited the reading of it; and then in 1642, *Urban* himself in a public decree, pronounced it contaminated with several errors long since rejected by the church.

§ 40. The Jesuits and the Romish edicts, were opposed by the doctors of Louvain, and by the other admirers of *Augustine*, who were always

mony: (for the opinions of *St. Thomas* in respect to grace, do not much differ from those of *Augustine*): and the most learned man they have, *Henry Noris*, (in his Vindiciæ Augustinianæ, cap. iv., Opp., tom. i., p. 1175), laments that he is not at liberty, in consequence of the pope's decree, to let the world know what was transacted in the *Congregations de auxiliis*, against *Molina* and the Jesuits, and in favour of *Augustine*. He says: Quando, recentiori Romano decreto id vetitum est, cum dispendio caussæ, quam defendo, necessariam defensionem omitto.

(185) For an account of this famous man, see *Bayle's* Dictionnaire, tome ii., p. 1529. *Melchior Leydecker*, de vita et morte Jansenii libri. iii., constituting the first part of his Historia Jansenismi, published at Utrecht 1695, 8vo. Dictionnaire des livres Jansenistes, tome i., p. 120, &c., and many others. This celebrated work, which gave a mortal wound to the Romish community that all the power and all the sagacity of the vicar of Jesus Christ were unable to heal, is divided into three parts. The first is historical, and narrates the origination of the Pelagian contests in the fifth century: the second investigates and explains the doctrine of *Augustine* concerning the state and powers of human nature, before the fall, as fallen, and as renewed. The third traces out his opinions concerning the assistance of Christ by his renewing grace, and the predestination of men and angels. The language is sufficiently clear and perspicuous, but not so correct as it should be. [*Jansenius* was born at a village near Leerdam in Flanders, A.D. 1585, educated at Louvain, where he became principal of the college of St. Pulcheria, doctor of theology in 1617, and professor in ordinary. He was twice sent by the university of Louvain to the Spanish court, to manage their affairs. His political work against France, entitled Mars Gallicus, procured him favour at the court of Spain; and he was appointed bishop of Ypres in 1635. He died in 1638, of a contagion taken by visiting his flock labouring under it. His *Augustinus*, in 3 vols. fol., cost him 20 years labour. He also wrote against the Protestants.—*Tr.*]

(186) Thus *Jansenius* in his Augustinus, tom. ii., Introductory book, cap. xxix, p. 65, says: Non ego hic de nova aliqua sententia reperienda disputo—sed de antiqua Augustini.—Quæritur, non quid de naturæ humanæ statibus et viribus, vel de Dei gratia et prædestinatione sentiendum sit; sed quid Augustinus olim ecclesiæ nomine et applausu —tradiderit, prædicaverit, scriptoque multipliciter consignaverit.

very numerous in the Low Countries. Hence there arose a formidable, and to the Belgic provinces a very troublesome controversy.(187) It had scarcely commenced, when it spread into the neighbouring France; where *John du Verger de Hauranne*, abbot of *St. Cyran* or *Sigeran*, an intimate friend of *Jansenius*, a man of an accomplished and elegant mind, and no less respected for the purity of his morals and the sanctity of his life than for his erudition, had already inspired great numbers with attachment to *Augustine* and hatred of the Jesuits.(188) The greatest part of the learned in this most flourishing kingdom, had connected themselves with the Jesuits; because their doctrines were more grateful to human nature, and better accorded with the nature of the Romish religion and the interests of that church, than the Augustinian principles. But the opposite party embraced besides some bishops of high reputation for piety, the men of the best and most cultivated minds almost throughout France; *Anthony Arnauld*, *Peter Nicole*, *Blaise Pascal*, *Paschasius Quesnel*, and the numerous other famous and excellent men who are denominated *the authors of Port-Royal*; likewise a great number of those who looked on the vulgar piety of the Romish church, which is confined to the confession of sins, frequent attendance on the Lord's supper, and some external works, as far short of what Christ requires of his followers, and who believed that the soul of a Christian, who would be accounted truly pious, ought to be full of genuine faith and love to God. Thus as the one party had the advantage of numbers and power, and the other that of talent and pious fervour, it is not difficult to understand why this controversy is still kept up a whole century after its commencement.(189)

(187) [The principal adherents to *Jansenius* in the Netherlands, were, *James Boonen*, the archbishop of Mechlen; *Libertus Fromond*, a pupil, friend, and successor of *Jansenius* in the professorial chair at Louvain; and *Henry Calen*, a canon of Mechlen and arch-priest of Brussels.—*Schl.*]

(188) He is esteemed by all the Jansenists, as highly as *Jansenius* himself; and he is said to have aided *Jansenius* in composing his Augustinus. Those French especially who are partial to the doctrines of Augustine, reverence him as a father and an oracle, and extol him above *Jansenius* himself. His life and history have been duly written, by *Claude Lancelot*, Mémoires touchant la vie der Mr. S. Cyran; published at Cologne (or rather at Utrecht), 1738, 2 vols. 8vo. Add the Recueil de plusiers piéces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal, p. 1–150, Utrecht, 1740, 8vo. *Arnaud d'Andilly*, Mémoires au sujet de l'Abbé de S. Cyran; printed in the Vies des Religieuses de Port-Royal, tome i., p. 15–44. *Bayle*, Dictionnaire, tome ii., [p. 531, art. *Garasse*, note D.—*Tr.*] Dictionnaire des livres Jansenistes, tome i., p. 133, &c. See also respecting his early studies, *Gabriel Liron*, Singularités Histor. et Litter., tome iv., p. 507, &c. [*Jo. Verger de Hauranne* was born at Bayonne in 1581, became abbot of St. Cyran in 1620, was thrown into prison by *Richelieu* in 1638, released in 1643, and died the same year, aged 62. He held much the same sentiments with *Jansenius*, and spread them extensively by conversation. His works are: Somme des Fautes, &c., de *Garasse*, (a Jesuit writer), 3 vols. 4to; Spiritual Letters, 2 vols. 4to.; Apology for Roche-Hosay, &c.; and Question Royale.—*Tr.*]

(189) The history of this controversy is to be found entire or in part, in a great number of books. The following may supersede all the rest: *Gabriel Gerberon*, Histoire generale du Jansenisme, Amsterd., 1700, 3 vols. 8vo, and Lyons, 1708, 5 vols. 12mo; the Abbé *du Mas*, (a senator of Paris, who died 1722), Histoire des cinq propositions de Jansenius, Liege, 1694, 8vo. *Du Mas* favours the Jesuits; *Gerberon* favours the Jansenists. *Michael Leydecker*, Historia Jansenismi Libri vi., Utrecht, 1695, 8vo. *Voltaire*, Siecle de Louis XIV tome ii., p. 264, &c. Many books on this subject by both parties, are mentioned in the Bibliotheque Janseniste ou Catalogue Alphabetique des principaux livres Jansenistes: published in 1735, 8vo, and said to be the work of *Dominic Colonia*, a learned Jesuit. See Recueil des peices pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal, p. 325, &c. But as already re-

§ 41. The attentive reader of this protracted contest, will be amused to see the artifices and stratagems, with which the one party conducted their attack and the other their defence. The Jesuits came forth, armed with decrees of the pontiff, mandates of the king, the most odious comparisons, the support of great men, the good-will of most of the bishops, and lastly force and bayonets. On the other hand, the Jansenists enervated those decrees and mandates, by the most subtle distinctions and interpretations, nay, by the same sophistry which they condemned in the Jesuits; odious comparisons they destroyed, by other comparisons equally odious; to the menaces of great men and bishops, they opposed the favour of the multitude; and physical force they vanquished by divine power, that is, by the miracles of which they boasted. Perceiving that their adversaries were not to be overcome by the soundest arguments and proofs, they endeavoured to conciliate the favour of the pontiffs and of the people at large, by their meritorious and splendid deeds and by their great industry. Hence they attacked those enemies of the church the Protestants, and endeavoured to circumvent them with spells and sophisms that were entirely new; they applied themselves to the education of youth of all classes, and imbued them with the elements of the liberal arts and sciences; they composed very neat and elegant treatises on grammar, philosophy, and the other branches of learning; they laid all classes from the highest to the lowest, under obligations to them, by devotional and practical treatises composed in the most elegant manner; they adopted a pure, natural, and agreeable style, and translated and explained in the very best manner, not a few of the ancient writers: and lastly, they sought to persuade, and actually did persuade very many, to believe that God himself espoused their cause, and that he had by many prodigies and miracles, placed the truth of the Augustinian doctrine beyond all controversy.(190) As all these things have

marked, this book much enlarged, appeared under the title of: Dictionnaire des livres Jansenistes, Antw., 1752, 4 vols. 8vo.

(190) That the Jansenists or Augustinians have long resorted to miracles in support of their cause, is very well known. And they themselves confess, that they have been saved from ruin when nearly in despair, by means of miracles. See Memoires de Port-Royal, tom. i., p. 256; tom. ii., p. 107. The first of these miracles were, those said to have been performed in the convent of Port-Royal, from the year 1656 onward, in the cure of several afflicted persons, by means of a thorn from that crown which the Roman soldiers placed on the head of our most holy Saviour. See Recueil de plusiers pièces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal, p. 228, 448. *Fontaine*, Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal, tom. ii., p. 131, &c. Other miracles followed, in the year 1661; Vies des Religieuses de Port-Royal, tom. i., p. 192: and in the year 1664; Mémoires de Port-Royal, tom. iii., p. 252. The fame of these miracles was great, and very useful to the Augustinians in the seventeenth century; but at present, it is quite hushed. In our age therefore, when hard pressed, they have resisted the fury of their enemies by new and more numerous prodigies. If we may believe them, the first occurred on the 31st of May, 1725, in the person of a certain woman named *De la Fosse;* who was suddenly cured of a bloody flux, when she had supplicated relief from a host carried by a priest of the Jansenian sect. Two years afterwards, in 1727, the tomb of *Gerhard Rousse*, a canon of Avignon, was ennobled by very splendid miracles. Lastly, in the year 1731, the bones of *Francis de Paris*, [commonly called, *Abbé de Paris*], which were interred at St. Medard, were famed for numberless miracles: and every one knows what warm disputes have occurred, and still continue, respecting them. It is also said, that *Paschasius Quesnel*, *Levier*, *Desangins*, and *Tournus*, those great ornaments of the sect, have often afforded relief to the sick who relied on their merits and intercession. See Jesus Christ sous l'anatheme et sous l'excommunication; a celebrated Jansenist book, written against the Bull *Unigenitus*, art. xvii., p. 61; art. xviii., p. 66, ed. Utrecht. A great part of

great influence with mankind, they often rendered the victory of the Jesuits quite dubious; and perhaps the Jansenists would have triumphed, if the cause of the Jesuits had not been the cause of the church, the safety of which depends in a great measure on those opinions which the Jesuits hold.

§ 42. Various circumstances lead to the conclusion, that *Urban* VIII., and afterwards *Innocent* X., were solicitous to suppress these dangerous commotions in their commencement; just as the former pontiffs wisely suppressed the contests between *Baius* and the Dominicans. But they were unable to do it, in consequence of the highly excitable and fervid tempers of the French. The adversaries of the Augustinian doctrines, extracted from the works of *Jansenius* five propositions, which were thought to be the worst; and instigated especially by the Jesuits, they urged *Innocent* incessantly to condemn them. A large part of the French clergy, by their envoys despatched to Rome, resisted such a measure with great zeal; and wisely suggested, that it was of the first importance to distinguish the different constructions that might be put upon those propositions; since they were ambiguous, and would admit of a true, as well as a false interpretation. *But Innocent* X. overcome by the incessant and importunate clamours of the Jesuits, without maturely considering the case, hastily condemned those propositions in a public edict, dated May 31st, 1653. The substance of the five propositions was, *First:* That there are some commands of God, which righteous and good men are absolutely unable to obey, though disposed to do it; and that God does not give them so much grace, that they are able to observe them.—*Secondly:* That no person, in this corrupt state of nature, *can* resist divine grace operating upon the mind.—*Thirdly:* That in order to a man's being praise or blame worthy before God, he need not be exempt from *necessity*, but only from *coercion*.—*Fourthly:* That the Semipelagians erred greatly, by supposing that the human will has the power of both admitting, and of rejecting, the operations of internal preventing grace.—*Fifthly:* That whoever affirms that Jesus Christ made expiation by his sufferings and death for the sins of *all* mankind, is a Semipelagian.—The four first of these propositions, *Innocent* pronounced to be directly heretical; but the fifth, he declared to be only rash, irreligious, and injurious to God.(191)

the Jansenists contend for the reality of these miracles, with good faith: for this sect abounds with persons, who are by no means corrupt, but whose piety is unenlightened, and to whom the truth and divinity of their cause appear so manifest, that they readily believe it cannot possibly be neglected by the Deity But it is incredible, that so many persons of distinguished perspicacity as formerly were and still are followers of this sect, should not know that either the powers of nature, or the operation of medicines, or the influence of the imagination, really accomplished these cures, which deceivers or men blinded by party zeal have ascribed to the almighty power of God. Such persons therefore, must be of the opinion, that it is lawful to promote a holy and righteous cause by means of deceptions, and to take advantage of the misapprehensions of the multitude, in order to confirm the truth.

(191) This *Bull* is extant in the Bullarium Romanum, tome v., p. 486. It is also published, together with many public Acts relating to this subject, by *Charles du Plessis d'Argentre*, in his Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, tom. iii, pt. ii., p. 261, &c. [*Dr. Mosheim* mistook, in regard to the sentence pronounced on the several propositions. The Bull says of the *first:* Temerariam, impiam, blasphemam, anathemate damnatam, et hæreticam declaramus, et uti talem damnamus. Of the *second*, and the *third*, it says simply: Hæreticam declaramus, et uti talem damnamus. Of the *fourth*, it says: Falsam, et hæreticam declaramus, et uti talem damnamus. And of the *fifth*, it says: Falsam, temerariam, scandalosam, et

§ 43. This sentence of the supreme ecclesiastical judge, was indeed painful and perplexing to the friends of *Jansenius*, and grateful and agreeable to their enemies; yet it did not fully satisfy the latter, nor entirely dishearten the former. For *Jansenius* himself had escaped condemnation, the pontiff not having declared that the heretical propositions were to be found in his Augustinus, in that sense in which they were condemned. The *Augustinians* therefore, under the guidance of the very acute *Anthony Arnauld*, distinguished in this controversy between the *point of law* and the *point of fact;* (*quæstionem juris* and *quæstionem facti*); that is, they maintained that we ought to believe those propositions to be justly condemned by the pontiff; but that it was not necessary to believe, nor had the pontiff required a belief, that those propositions were to be found in *Jansenius'* book, in that sense in which they were condemned.(192) Yet they were not allowed to enjoy this consolation long, for the pertinacious hatred of the adverse party drove *Alexander* VII., the successor of *Clement*, to such a height of imprudence, that he not only declared in a new Bull of the 16th of October, 1656, that the condemned propositions were those of *Jansenius*, and were to be found in his book; but he moreover in the year 1665, sent into France the formula of an oath, which was to be subscribed by all who would enjoy any office in the church, and which affirmed that the five condemned propositions were actually to be found in *Jansenius'* book, in the very sense in which they had been condemned by the church.(193) This imprudent step, which was viewed as intolerable not only by the Jansenists but likewise by the better part of the French clergy, was followed by immense commotions and contests. The Jansenists immediately contended, that the pontiff might err, especially when pronouncing an opinion without the presence of a council, in all questions of *fact;* and therefore that they were not under obligation to subscribe to that formula, which required that they should swear to a matter of fact: the Jesuits on the contrary, had the boldness to maintain publicly, in the city of Paris, that the pope's infallibility was equally certain and divine in matters of fact, as in contested points of ecclesiastical law. Some of the Jansenists said, they would neither condemn nor approve the formula; but they promised by observing silence, to show respect to the authority of the head of the church. Others appeared ready to subscribe with some explanation, or distinction, oral or written, annexed; but by no means, without qualification. Others attempted other modes of evasion.(194) But none of these courses would satisfy the impassioned mind of the Jesuits; and therefore the recusants were miserably harassed with banishments, imprisonments, and other vexations; for the Jesuits had the control and guidance of the measures of the court.

intellectam eo sensu, ut Christus pro salute dumtaxat prædestinatorum mortuus sit: Impiam, blasphemam, contumeliosam, divinæ pietati derogantem, et hæreticam declaramus, et uti talem damnamus. So that the sentence on the *fifth* proposition was the most severe; and that on the *first*, next to it in severity.—*Tr*]

(192) Dictionnaire des livres Jansenistes, tom. i., p. 249; tom. ii., p. 7, &c.

(193) This Bull also, together with various documents, is in *Charles du Plessis d'Argentre's* Collectio Judiciorum de novis erroribus, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 281–288, 306. The formula of the oath by *Alexander* VII., occurs ibid., p. 314, together with the ordinance of the king, and other papers.

(194) See *Du Mas*, Histoire des cinq Propositions, p. 158, &c. *Gerberon*, Histoire generale du Jansenisme, pt. ii., p. 516, and many others.

§ 44. In consequence of the lenity or the prudence of *Clement* IX., the persecuted party, who to their own loss and injury defended *Augustine*, had some respite in the year 1669. This was procured by four French bishops, those of Angers, Beauvais, Pamiers, and Alet, who courageously declared, that they could not conscientiously subscribe to the prescribed oath, without adding some explanation. And when the Romish court threatened them with punishment, nineteen other bishops espoused their cause, and addressed letters in their behalf both to the king and to the pontiff. These were also joined by *Anne Genevieve de Bourbon*, a lady of great heroism, and after her renunciation of the pleasures and allurements of the world, a warm friend of the Jansenists; who very urgently besought *Clement* IX. to assume more moderation. Influenced by entreaties and arguments so numerous and of so much weight, *Clement* consented that such as chose, might subscribe the oath above mentioned, annexing an exposition of their own views. Upon this liberty being allowed, the former tranquillity returned; and the friends of *Jansenius* now freed from all fear, lived securely in their own country. This celebrated event is usually called the *peace of Clement* IX. But it was not of long continuance.(195) For the king of France at the instigation of the Jesuits, disturbed it by his edict of 1676; in which he represented it as granted only for a time, and in condescension to the weak consciences of certain persons; and on the death of *Anne de Bourbon* in 1679, it was wholly subverted. From this time, the Augustinian party were harassed with the same injuries and persecutions, as before. Some avoided them by a voluntary exile; others endured them with fortitude and magnanimity; and others warded them off, by such means as they could. The head and leader of the sect, *Anthony Arnauld*,(196) to avoid the fury of his enemies, fled in the year 1679 into the Low Countries; to the great injury of the Jesuits. For this man possessing extraordinary eloquence and acuteness of mind, instilled his doc-

(195) The transactions relative to this subject under the pontificate of *Clement* IX., are fully narrated, by cardinal *Rospigliosi*, in his commentaries: which *Charles du Plessis d'Argentre* has subjoined to his elementa Theologica, Paris, 1716, 8vo, and which are also extant in the Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, tom iii, part ii., p. 336, where likewise are the letters of *Clement* IX. Among the Jansenists, the history of the peace of *Clement* IX. has been expressly written by *Varet*, the vicar of the archbishop of Sens; (for the Catechisme Historique sur les contestations de l'Eglise, tom. i., p. 352, testifies, that *Varet* wrote the anonymous history): viz., Relation de ce qui s'est passe dans l'affaire de la paix de l'Eglise sous le Pape Clement IX., 1706, 12mo, and by *Paschasius Quesnel*, (whom *Dominic Colonia* among others, Biblioth. Janseniste, p. 314, declares to have been the author), in his book: La paix de Clement IX., ou démonstration des deux fausses-tez capitales avancés dans l'Histoire des cinq Propositions contre la foi des disciples de S. Augustin; Chamberry, or rather Brussels, 1701, 2 vols. 12mo. The following work: Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans l'affaire de la paix de l'Eglise sous le Pape Clement IX., avec les Lettres, Actes, Memoires, et autres pièces qui y ont rapport, without mention of the place, 1706, 2 vols. 8vo, is an accurately written history. The part which *Anne de Bourbon* took in this business, is elegantly narrated by *Villefort*, in his Vie d'Anne Genevieve de Bourbon, Duchesse de Longueville, tome ii., livr. vi., p. 89, edit. Amsterd., 1739, 8vo, which is much fuller than the Paris edition.

(196) For an account of this great man, see *Bayle*, Dictionnaire, [art. Arnauld], tome i., p. 337, and Histoire abregée de la vie et des Ouvrages de Mr. Arnaud; Cologne, 1695, 8vo. On the transition of the Dutch church to the Jansenist party, see *Lefitau*, Vie de Clement IX., tome i., p. 123, &c. Respecting *Codde*, *Neercassel*, *Varlet*, and other defenders of the Jansenist cause in Holland, see Dictionnaire des livres Jansenistes, tom. i., p. 48, 121, 353; tom. ii., p. 406; tom. iv., p. 119, &c., and in many other places.

trines into the minds of the greatest part of the Belgians; and also induced that portion of the Romish church that was situated among the Dutch, to join the Jansenist party, through the influence of *John Neercassel* bishop of Castorie, and *Peter Codde* archbishop of Sebaste. This Dutch [Catholic] church remains to the present day, firmly fixed in its purpose, and being safe under the powerful protection of the Dutch government, it despises the indignation of the pontiffs which it incurs in a very high degree.

§ 45. The Jansenists, or *Augustinians* as they choose to be called, were so very odious to the Jesuits, not merely on account of their doctrine respecting divine grace, (which was in reality the Augustinian doctrine, and almost identical with that of the followers of *Calvin*, only differently coloured and displayed), but there were many other things in them, which the defenders of the Romish church cannot approve and tolerate. For it was under Jansenist leaders, that all those contests in the Romish church which we have mentioned above, originated, and have been continued down to our times, in numberless publications printed in the Low Countries and in France.(197) But there is hardly any thing in them, which the Jesuits and the loyal subjects of the Roman pontiffs regard as more intolerable, than the system of morals and of practical piety which they inculcate. For in the view of the Jansenists, there is nothing entirely sound and uncorrupted in the practice and institutions of the Romish church. In the first place they complain, that the whole body of the clergy have forsaken altogether the duties of their office. They moreover assert, that the monks are really apostates; and they would have them be brought back to their pristine sanctity, and to that strict course of life which the founders of the several orders prescribed. They would also have the people well instructed in the knowledge of religion and Christian piety. They contend, that the sacred volume and the books containing the forms of public worship, should be put into the hands of the people in the vernacular tongue of each nation, and should be diligently read and studied by all. And lastly, they assert, that all the people should be carefully taught that true piety towards God does not consist in external acts and rites, but in purity of heart and divine love. These things considered in a general view, no one can censure, unless he is himself vicious or a stranger to the principles of Christianity. But if we descend to particulars, and inquire how they trained their people for heaven, it will appear that Jansenian piety leaned greatly towards insupportable superstition and the harsh and fanatical opinions of the so-called Mystics; and therefore, that it is not entirely without reason, they were branded by their adversaries with the title of *Rigorists*.(198)

(197) See above, Century xvi., History of the Romish church, § 31, &c., [p. 105, &c., of this volume.]

(198) Those who wish for a fuller knowledge of that gloomy piety which the Jansenists commonly prescribed to their people, and which was indeed coincident with the patterns set by those that anciently inhabited the desert parts of Egypt, Libya, and Syria, but was equally remote from the prescriptions of Christ and of right reason, may read only the *Letters* and the other writings of the *abbot of St. Cyran*, whom the Jansenists regard almost as an oracle. He may be called a frank, ingenuous man, sincere in his intercourse with God, superior to most teachers of piety among the Romanists; he may also be called a learned man, and very well acquainted with the opinions and the affairs of the ancients; but, with the Jansenists, to pronounce him the greatest and best, the perfect pattern of holiness, and the most correct teacher of true piety, is what no one can do, unless he affixes new meanings to these terms, and meanings unknown in the sacred writings. That we may not seem to do injustice to so great a man, we will confirm these remarks by some specimens of his wis-

Their doctrine respecting penitence especially, was injurious both to church and state. They made penitence to consist principally in voluntary punishments, which a sinner should inflict on himself in proportion to his offences. For they maintained, that since man is by nature most corrupt and most wretched, he ought to retire from the world and from business, and to expiate, as it were, his inherent corruption, by continual hardships and tortures of the body, by fasting, by hard labour, by prayer, and by meditation; and the more depravity any one has, either by nature, or contracted by habit, the more distress and anguish of body he should impose on himself. And in this matter they were so extravagant, that they did not hesitate to call those the greatest saints, and the *sacred victims of penitence*, consumed by the fire of divine love, who intentionally pined away and died

dom and virtue. This honest man undertook in a long work, to confute the *heretics*, that is, the Protestants. And for this purpose, it was necessary for him to examine the books written by this wicked class of men. But before he proceeded to read any of them, with *Martin de Barcos* his nephew, a man very like to his uncle, he was accustomed to expel the devil out of them by the sign of the cross. What weakness did this manifest! This very holy man, forsooth, was persuaded that the enemy of mankind had taken up his residence in these writings of the heretics: but it is difficult to tell, where he supposed the arch fiend to lie concealed, whether in the paper, or in the letters, or between the leaves, or lastly in the sentiments themselves. Let us hear *Claude Lancelot*, in his Mémoires touchant la vie de Mr. l'Abbé de S. Cyran, tome i., p. 226. He says: Il lisoit ces livres avec tant de pieté, qu'en les prenant il les exorcisoit toujours en faisant le signe de la croix dessus, ne doutant point que le Demon n'y residoit actuellement. He was so charmed with *Augustine*, as to receive for divine, all his sentiments without discrimination, and even those which all good men among the Catholics themselves, regard as faults in that father. Among others may be mentioned that dangerous doctrine, that the saints are the legitimate proprietors of the whole world, and that the wicked unjustly possess according to the divine law, those things of which they are lawful proprietors according to human laws. Thus, in *Nicholas Fontaine's* Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal, tom i., p. 201, he says: Jesus Christ n'est encore entré dans la possession de son Royaume temporel et des biens du monde, qui luy appartiennent, que par cette *petite portion* qu'en tient l'Eglise par les benefices de ses Clercs, qui ne sont que les fermiers et les depositaires de Jesus Christ. So then, if we believe him, a golden age is coming, in which Jesus Christ will dethrone all kings and princes, and seizing upon the whole world will transfer it entire to his church, of which the leaders are the priests and monks. Will the Jansenists now come forth and proclaim, that they make it their greatest care to secure civil governments against the machinations of the Roman pontiffs! Respecting prayer, he philosophizes entirely in the spirit of those who are called Mystics. For he denies that those who would pray, should consider beforehand what they would ask of God; because prayer does not consist in the thoughts and conceptions of the mind, but in a sort of blind impulse of divine love. *Lancelot*, Mémoires touchant la Vie de l'Abbé de S. Cyran, tome ii., p. 44, says: Il ne croyoit pas, que l'on dût faire quelque effort pour s'appliquer à quelque point ou à quelque pensée particuliere—par ce que la veritable priere est plutôt un attrait de son amour qui emporte nôtre cœur vers lui et nous enleve comme hors de nous-mêmes, que non pas une occupation de nôtre Esprit qui se remplisse de l'idee de quelque objet quoique divin. He therefore prays best, who asks for nothing, and excludes all thoughts from his mind. Jesus Christ and his disciples knew nothing of this sublime philosophy: for he directs us to pray in a set form of words; and they, the apostles, frequently acquaint us with the subject matter of their prayers. But of all his errors this undoubtedly was the worst, that he had no doubts but that he was an instrument of God, by which the divine Being operates and works; and that he held generally, that a pious man should follow the impulses of his mind, suspending all exercise of his judgment. And the opinion was most deeply fixed in the minds of all the Jansenists, that God himself acts and operates on the mind and reveals to it his pleasure, when all movements of the understanding and the will are restrained and hushed. Hence, whatever thoughts, opinions, or purposes occur to them in that state of quietude, they unhesitatingly regard as oracular manifestations and instructions from God. See Mémoires de Port-Royal, tome iii., p. 246, &c.

under these various kinds of sufferings and hardships; nay, they taught that this class of *suicides* were able to appease the wrath of God, and to merit much for the church and for their friends before God, by means of their pains and sufferings. This appears from numerous examples, but especially from that of *Francis de Paris* [or the *Abbé de Paris*], the worker of so many miracles in the Jansenist school, who brought on himself a most cruel death, in order to appease the wrath of God.(199)

§ 46. A striking example of this gloomy and extravagant devotion, was exhibited in the celebrated female convent called *Port-Royal in the fields* [*Port-Royal des Champs*], situated in a deep and narrow valley not far from Paris. King *Henry* IV. in the very commencement of this century, gave the superintendence of it to *Jaqueline*, (one of the daughters of the celebrated jurist, *Anthony Arnauld*), who afterwards bore the name of *Maria Angelica de S. Magdalena*. She at first led a very dissolute life, such as was common at that time in the French nunneries; but in the year 1609, the fear of God came upon her, and she entered upon a very different course of life: and afterwards, becoming intimate first with *Francis de Sales*, and then in 1623, with the abbot of *St. Cyran*, she conformed both herself and her convent to their views and prescriptions. The consequence was, that this religious house for nearly a century excited in the Jesuits the highest disgust, and in the Jansenists the highest admiration; and its fame spread over all Europe. The consecrated virgins inhabiting it, followed with the utmost strictness the ancient, severe, and almost every where abrogated rule of the Cistercians; nay they imposed on themselves more rigours and burdens than even that rule prescribed.(200) A great propor-

(199) See *John Morin's* Comment. de Pœnitentia, Præf., p. iii., &c., in which there is a tacit censure of the Jansenian notions of penitence. On the other hand, see the *Abbé de S. Cyran*, in the Mémoires de Port-Royal, tome iii., p. 483. The Jansenists reckon the restoration of true penitence, among the principal merits of *S. Cyran*; and they call him the second father of the doctrine of penitence. See Mémoires de Port-Royal, tome iii., p. 445, 504, &c. Yet this very penitence of his, was not the least of the causes for which he was thrown into prison by order of cardinal *Richelieu*. See ibid., tom. i., p. 233, &c., 452, &c.

(200) There are extant a multitude of books of various kinds, in which the Jansenists describe and deplore the fortunes, the holiness, the regulations, and the destruction of this celebrated seat. We shall mention only those that are at hand and more recent, as well as more full than the others. First, the Benedictines of St. Maur present a correct but dry history of the convent, in their Gallia Christiana, tom. viii., p. 910, &c. A much neater and more pleasing history, though imperfect and somewhat chargeable with partiality, is that of the noted French poet, *John Racine*, Abregé de l'Histoire de Port-Royal; which is printed among the works of his son, *Lewis Racine*, sixth edition, Amsterd., 1750, 6 vols. 8vo, and is in vol. ii., p. 275–366. The external state and form of this convent, are formally described by *Moleon*, Voyages Liturgiques, p. 234. To these add, *Nicholas Fontaine's* Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal, Cologne, (that is, Utrecht), 1738, 2 vols. 8vo. *Peter Thomas du Fosse's* Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal, Cologne, 1739, 8vo. Recueil de plusieurs pièces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal, Utrecht, 1740, 8vo. The editor of these papers promises in his Preface more Collections of the same nature; and he affords no slight indication, that from these and other documents, some one may compose a perfect history of the *Port-Royal*, which so many Jansenists regarded as the gate of heaven. *Claude Lancelot* has also much that relates to this subject, in his History of the Abbot St. Cyran. These and other works describe only the external state, and the various fortunes of this celebrated convent. The internal state, the mode of life, and numberless events that occurred among the nuns themselves and among their neighbours, are described in the Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal et à la Vie de Marie Angelique d'Arnaud, Utrecht, 1742, 5 tomes, 8vo. Vies interessantes et edifiantes des Religieuses de Port-Royal et des plusieurs

tion of the *Jansenist penitents* of both sexes and all ranks, built for themselves cottages without the precincts of this cloister; and there they led a life not unlike that which we read of in the fourth and fifth centuries, as led by those austere recluses called *Fathers of the Desert* who lived in the desert parts of Egypt and Syria. For it was the object of them all, to efface from their souls the stains which were either innate or acquired by habits of sinning, by means of voluntary pains and sufferings inflicted on themselves, by silence, by hunger and thirst, by praying, labouring, watching, and enduring pain.(201) Yet they did not all pursue the same species of labour. The more learned applied themselves to writing books; and not a few of them did great service to the cause of both sacred and profane learning. Others instructed youth in the elements of languages and the arts. But most of them exhausted the powers of both mind and body amid rustic and servile labours, and wore themselves out, as it were, by a slow and lingering death. And many of these were illustrious personages and noblemen, who had before obtained the highest honours both in the cabinet and in the field; but who were not ashamed now to assume the place and perform the duties of the lowest servants. This celebrated retreat of *Jansenian penitence* experienced vicissitudes throughout this century; at one time it flourished very highly, at another it was nearly broken up. At last, as the nuns pertinaciously refused to subscribe the oath proposed by *Alexander* VII. which has been mentioned, and as considerable injury to the commonwealth and much disgrace to distinguished families were supposed to arise from this convent and its regulations, *Lewis* XIV. in the year 1709, by the instigation of the Jesuits, ordered the edifice to be pulled down and entirely demolished, and the nuns to be transferred to Paris; and two years after, that nothing might remain to nourish superstition he ordered the bodies that were buried there, to be disinterred and removed to other places.

§ 47. The other commotions which disturbed the tranquillity of the Romish church, were but light clouds compared with this tempest. The old quarrel between the Dominicans and the Franciscans, whether the mother of Jesus Christ was conceived without sin or depravity, (which the

personnes qui leur étoient attachées. Of this work, four volumes have already been published; the first appeared, Utrecht, 1750, 8vo. They all contain various documents, of no inconsiderable value. The last fortunes and overthrow of the convent are described especially, in the Mémoires sur la destruction de l'Abbaye de Port-Royal des Champs; without place, 1711, 8vo. If I do not wholly mistake, these writers add much less to the reputation and glory of this noted convent, than the Jansenists suppose. When I read their writings, *Anthony Arnauld*, *Tillemont*, *Nicole*, *Isaac le Maitre*, and the many others who are known by the name of the Authors of Port-Royal, appear to me great and extraordinary men. But when I lay aside *their* books, and turn to those just mentioned in which the private lives of these great men are described, they appear to me small men, fanatics, and unworthy of their high reputation. I readily give to *Isaac le Maitre* commonly called *Sacy*, the praise of a most polished genius, while reading his orations or his other lucubrations; but when I meet him at *Port-Royal*, with a sickle in his hand, in company with rustics cutting down the corn, he makes a comical figure, and seems not altogether in his right mind.

(201) The first that retired to Port-Royal in 1637, in order to purge away his sins, was the very eloquent and highly-celebrated Parisian advocate, *Isaac le Maitre*; whose retirement brought much odium upon the Abbot *St. Cyran*. See Mémoires pour l'Histoire de Port-Royal, tome i., p. 233, &c. He was followed by many others of various classes and ranks, among whom were men of the noblest birth. See Vies des Religieuses de Port-Royal, tome i, p. 141, &c.

Dominicans denied, and the Franciscans affirmed), gave considerable trouble to *Paul* V., *Gregory* XV., and *Alexander* VII. Not long after the commencement of the century, it began to disturb Spain very considerably, and to produce parties. Therefore the kings of Spain, *Philip* III. and IV., sent some envoys to Rome, urgently soliciting the pontiffs to decide the question by a public decree. But the pontiffs deemed it more important to follow prudence, than to gratify requests from so high authority. For on the one hand, the splendour of the Spanish throne which inclined to the opinion of the Franciscans, and on the other, the credit and influence of the Dominican family, were terrific objects. Nothing therefore could be obtained by repeated supplications, except that the pontiffs by words and by ordinances, determined that the cause of the Franciscans was very plausible, and forbid the Dominicans to assail it in public; while at the same time, they would not allow the Franciscans and others to charge error upon the opinion of the Dominicans.(202) In a king or magistrate such reluctance to pass judgment, would be commendable; but whether it was suitable in a man, who claims to be the divinely-constituted judge of all religious causes, and to be placed beyond all danger of erring by the immediate power and guidance of the Holy Spirit, those may answer, who support the reputation and honour of the pontiffs.

§ 48. Towards the close of this century, the Mystics, whose reputation and influence were formerly so great, were exposed to very severe treatment. The first sufferer was *Michael de Molinos*, a Spanish priest resident at Rome, in high reputation for sanctity, and therefore attended by numerous disciples of both sexes. In the year 1681, he published at Rome, his *Way* or *Guide* to what the Mystics call *a spiritual* or *contemplative life*,(203) that is, *Institutes of Mystic Theology;* in which he was thought to recall from the lower world the capital errors of the old *Beghards* and *Beguins*, and to open the door for all iniquity and wickedness. The sub-

(202) See *Fred. Ulrich Calixtus*, Historia immaculatæ conceptionis B. Virginis Mariæ, Helmst., 1696, 4to. Add *Jo Hornbeck's* Comment. ad Bullam Urbani VIII. de diebus festis, p. 250. *Jo. Launoi*, Præscriptiones de conceptu Virginis Mariæ, Opp., tom. i., pt. i., p. 9, &c. *Clement* XI. a long time after this, namely in the year 1708, proceeded some farther, and by a special bull commanded all Catholics to observe a festival in memory of the conception of St. Mary, a stranger to all sin. See Mémoires de Trevoux, for the year 1709, A. xxxviii., p. 514. But the Dominicans most firmly deny, that the obligations of this law extend to them; and they persevere in defending their old opinion, though with more modesty than formerly. And when we consider that this opinion is by no means condemned by the pontiff, and that the Dominicans are not molested though they do not celebrate that festival; it is evident that the language of the Romish edict is to be construed in the most liberal manner, and that the decree does not contradict the earlier decrees of the pontiffs. See *Lamindus Pritanius*, or *Muratori*, de ingeniorum moderatione in religionis negotio, p. 254, &c.

(203) This book was written in Spanish and first published in 1675, supported by the recommendations of the greatest and most respectable men. In 1681, it was published at Rome in Italian; though it had appeared in this language some time before, in other places. Afterwards it was translated into the Dutch, French, and Latin languages; and was very often printed in Holland, France, and Italy. The Latin translation under the title of *Manuductio spiritualis*, was published by *Aug. Herm. Franck*, Halle, 1687, 8vo. In Italian, it bore the title of *Guida Spirituale*. Annexed to it, is another tract of *Molinos*, de communione quotidiana; which was also condemned. See Recueil de diverses pièces concernant le Quietisme et les Quietistes, ou Molinos, ses sentimens et ses disciples, Amsterd., 1688, 8vo. In this work, the first piece is *Molinos'* book in the French translation, and then various epistles relating to his affairs and his sentiments.

stance of his system, which his friends interpret in one way and his enemies in another, amounted to this: that all religion consists in a certain quietude of the soul, withdrawn from external and finite objects and turned towards God, and loving him sincerely and without any hope of reward; or, what amounts to the same thing, if I mistake not: that the mind of a person in pursuit of the supreme good, must be entirely withdrawn from intercourse with the world around him, or from corporeal objects; and the efforts of the understanding and the will being all hushed, the mind must be merged wholly in God, from whom it originated. Hence his followers were called *Quietists;* though the common appellation of *Mystics*, would have been more proper. For the doctrine of *Molinos* was accounted new, only because he expressed himself in new phraseology which was not become trite by common use, and because he arranged and digested in a better form, what the ancients stated confusedly. The Jesuits and others who watched for the interests of the Romish cause, readily perceived that *Molino's* system tacitly accused the Romish church of a departure from true religion; for that church as is well known, makes piety to consist chiefly in ceremonies and external works. But it was the French ambassador especially, and his friends, who prosecuted the man. And from this and other circumstances, it has been plausibly inferred, that political considerations as well as religious, had their influence in this controversy; and that this Spaniard had opposed the wishes and the projects of the French king, in some difficult negotiations.(204) However this may be, *Molinos*, though he had a vast number of friends, and though the pontiff himself *Innocent* XI. was partial to him, was thrown into prison in 1685; and after publicly renouncing the errors charged upon him in 1687, he was delivered over to perpetual imprisonment; in which situation, he died at an advanced age in 1696.(205) Every honest and impartial man will be ready to grant, that the opinions of *Molinos* were greatly distorted and misrepresented by his enemies, the Jesuits and the French, for whose interest it was that he should be put out of the way; and that he was charged with consequences from his principles, which he neither admitted nor even thought of. On the other hand, I think it obvious that his system included most of the faults, which are justly chargeable upon the Mystics;

(204) [Yet perhaps the whole may be ascribed to the power of the Jesuits over the French court, who had father *La Chaise* confessor to *Louis* XIV. on their side; and he controlled madam *Maintenon*, and through her the superstitious *Louis*. And a king, who two years before had been induced to sacrifice to his own bigotry some millions of his loyal and industrious subjects, might easily be persuaded from a lust for spiritual conquests, to persecute a single man who was a stranger; and to oblige the pope also, to abandon for a time a man whom he loved and honoured, and to whom he had assigned a residence near his own palace; and especially, as the Inquisition were suspicious of the pontiff's own soundness in the faith.—*Schl.*]

(205) He was born in the vicinity of Saragossa, in 1627; according to the testimony of *Domin. de Colonia*, in the Bibliotheque Janseniste, p. 469. See, on this whole subject, the *Narrative respecting Quietism*, which is subjoined to the German translation of *Gilbert Burnet's* Travels. *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, part iii., ch. xvii., p 176. *Jo. Wolfg. Jæger's* Historia eccles. et polit., sæcul. xvii., decenn. ix., p. 26, &c. *Charles Plessis d'Argentre's* Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 357, where the papal bulls are given. [The documents of the whole proceedings of the Inquisition and of the pontiff against *Molinos*, are given us by *Nicholas Terzagus*, bishop of Narni in Italy, in his Theologia Historico-Mystica adv. vet. et novos pseudo-mysticos, quorum Historia texitur, et errores confutantur, Venice, 1764. fol., p. 8, &c.—*Tr.*]

and that it was well suited to the disposition of those who obtrude upon others as divine and oracular communications, the suggestions of their own heated imaginations, uncontrolled by reason and judgment.(206)

§ 49. It would have been very strange, if a man of such a character had not had disciples and followers. It is said that a considerable portion of the inhabitants of Spain, France, and the Netherlands, eagerly entered upon the way of salvation which he pointed out. Nor will this appear incredible, if it be considered, that in all the Catholic countries there is a large number of persons, who have discernment enough to see that outward ceremonies and bodily mortifications cannot be the whole of religion, and yet have not light enough to be able to arrive at the truth, by their own efforts and without a guide. But these nascent commotions were suppressed by the church in their commencement, in some places by threatenings and punishments, and in others by blandishments and promises; and *Molinos* himself being put out of the way, his disciples and friends did not appear formidable. Among the friends and avowers of Quietistic sentiments, the following persons especially have been often mentioned, namely, *Peter Matthew Petrucci*, a pious man and one of the Romish cardinals; *Francis de la Combe* a Barnabite, and instructer of Madam *Guyon*, who is soon to be mentioned; *Francis Malavalle; Berniere de Louvigni;* and some others of less note. These differed from each other and from *Molinos*, in many particulars, as is common with Mystics who are governed more by the visions of their own minds than by fixed rules and principles. Yet if we disregard words and look only at their import, we shall find that they all set out from the same principles, and tended to the same results.(207)

§ 50. In France, the Quietistic doctrine was supposed to be disseminated by the writings of *Jane Maria Bouvieres de la Mothe Guyon*, a lady of distinction, of no bad intentions, and exemplary in her life, but of a fickle temper, and one whose feelings measured and controlled her religious belief; than which nothing can be more fallacious.(208) As her religious

(206) What can be said in Defence of Molinos, has been collected by *Christ. Eberh. Weismann*, Historia Eccles., sæcul. xvii., p. 555.

(207) The writings of these persons are enumerated. with remarks upon them, by *Domin. de Colonia*, in his Bibliotheca Quietistica, subjoined to his Biblioth. Janseniana, p. 455, 488. *Godfr. Arnold*, Historia et descriptio Theol. Mysticæ, p. 364, and *Peter Poiret*, Bibliotheca Mysticorum, Amsterd., 1708, 8vo. [Cardinal *Petrucci*, born in 1636 at Ancona, cardinal 1686, died 1701; wrote Theologia Contemplativa; Spiritual Letters and Tracts; on the government of the passions; Mystic Riddle; Apology for the Quietists, &c., printed collectively, Venice, 1684.—*La Combe* was a native of Savoy, and a zealous propagator of Quietism in France. He wrote Analysis orationis mentalis; and was committed to the Bastile in 1687, where he ended his days.—*Malavalle* was born at Marseilles 1627, became blind in infancy; yet he composed, Pratique facile pour elever l'ame à la contemplation; Poesies Sacrées, &c.; and died at Marseilles in 1719.—*De Louvigni* was king's counsellor and treasurer at Caen, and died 1659. He wrote, Chrêtien interieur; and, Œuvres spirituelles, ou Conduite assûrée pour ceux qui tendent à la perfection.—*Tr.*]

(208) This lady wrote the History of her own life; which was published in French, at Cologne, (as the title-page falsely states), 1720, 12mo. Her writings, full of allegories and of not very solid mystic phrases, have been translated into German. There is extant also, her Bible with annotations: La Bible de Mad. Guyon avec des Explications et Reflexions, qui regard la vie interieure, Cologne, (or rather Amsterdam), 1715, 20 vols. 8vo. From these notes especially, the genius of this lady may be learned; which was indeed fecund, but not very vigorous. See also concerning her, Letters de Mad. *de Maintenon*, tom. i., p. 249, tom. ii., p. 45, 47, 49, 51, &c. [She was born in 1648, married at the age of 16, became a widow with three childen, at 28. Always charitable to the poor and very devotional, she now

opinions gave offence to many, they were in the year 1687 submitted to the examination of several great and dignified men, and were finally pronounced erroneous and unsound; and in 1697, they were formally confuted, by *Jac. Benignus Bossuet* the bishop of Meaux. From this contest arose a greater one, between the two men, who at that time as all are agreed, stood first among the French for genius and eloquence; that is, the above-named *Bossuet*, and *Francis Salignac de Fenelon*, bishop of Cambray and highly renowned throughout Europe. *Bossuet* asked *Fenelon* to approve and recommend his book against the errors of Madam *Guyon*. *Fenelon* on the contrary, not only maintained that this pious lady was groundlessly taxed by her adversary with many faults, but also in a book which he published in 1697,(209) himself adopted some of her opinions; and especially that mystical precept that we ought to love God purely, [or simply for what he is], and without the expectation of any reward; and he confirmed the principle by the suffrages of the most eminent saints. Provoked by this dissent from him, *Bossuet*, in whose view glory was the highest good, did not cease importuning *Lewis* XIV. and *Innocent* XII. till the pontiff in 1699, by a public decree branded as erroneous *Fenelon's* book, and especially twenty-three propositions extracted from it, but without mentioning the author's name. *Fenelon* was induced either by his timidity or prudence, to approve the sentence pronounced against himself, without any exceptions; and to recommend it himself to the churches under his care.(210) Many contend that this was the magnanimous deed of a great mind, docile and disposed to prefer the peace of the church to personal honour; but others say, that it was the mark of either a pusillanimous or a treacherous man, who deems it lawful to profess with his lips, what he disbelieves in his heart. This indeed few if any will doubt, that *Fenelon* continued to the end of life in those sentiments, which at the command of the pontiff, he had publicly rejected and condemned.

§ 51. Besides these authors of great commotions, there were others,

devoted her whole time to religion. She spent several years with the bishop of Geneva, and then travelled with *La Combe*, in different parts of France, conversing every where upon religion. Returning to Paris in 1687, she propagated her religious views not only by conversation, but by a tract on prayer, and another on the Canticles. Her persecutions soon commenced; and she was confined in monasteries and prisons, much of the time till 1702, when she retired to Blois, and lived in obscurity till her death, 1719. —The poet *Cowper* caused a selection of her poems to be translated and published in English; and her Life, with her short and easy method of prayer, and a Poem on the nativity, were published, Baltimore, 1812, 12mo.—*Tr.*]

(209) Explication des Maximes des Saintes sur la vie interieure, Paris, 1697, 12mo. It is also extant in a Latin translation.

(210) The history of this controversy is given at large and with sufficient fairness, by *Toussaints du Plessis*, a Benedictine, in his Histoire de l'Eglise de Meaux, livr. v., tome i., p. 485–523. There is more partiality in *Ramsay's* Histoire de la vie de Messire F. S. de la Mothe Fenelon, Hague, 1723. 12mo. yet it is worth reading. See also *Voltaire*, Siecle de Louis XIV., tome ii., p. 301. The public Acts are given by *Charles du Plessis d'Argentre*, Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 402, &c.; [also in *Nich. Terzagus*, Theologia Historico-Mystica, diss. iii., p. 26, &c. It is the object of this bitter polemic, to confute all the Quietists, and especially *Molinos* and *Fenelon*. *Andrew Michael Ramsay*, commonly called the *Chevalier Ramsay*, was a Scotchman, educated at Edinburgh; who went to Holland, there imbibed some notions of Quietism, went to Cambray to consult *Fenelon*, and was by him converted to the Catholic faith. After spending much of his life in France, he returned to Scotland in 1725, and died in 1743. He wrote much, chiefly on history, and altogether in French. His Life of Fenelon betrays the partiality of a particular friend and admirer.—*Tr.*]

who more slightly disturbed the public tranquillity of the Romish church by their novel and singular opinions. Of this description were the following. *Isaac la Peyrere*, (*Peyrerius*), who published two small works in 1655, in which he maintained that *Moses* has not recorded the origin of the human race, but only that of the Jewish nation; and that other races of men inhabited our world, long before *Adam* the father of the Jews. Although he was not a Roman Catholic when he promulgated this opinion, yet the Romish church deemed it their duty to punish an offence against religion in general; and therefore in the year 1656, cast him into prison at Brussels. And he would perhaps have been burned at the stake, had he not embraced the Romish religion, and renounced that of the Reformed in which he had been educated, and also publicly confessed his error.(211) *Thomas Albius* [*White*], or *Blacklo*, better known by the name of *Thomas Anglus* from his native country, published numerous tracts about the middle of the century, by which he acquired much notoriety in the Netherlands, France, Portugal, and England, and not a little hatred in his own church. He undoubtedly was acute and ingenious; but relying on the principles of the Peripatetic philosophy, to which he was extravagantly devoted, he ventured to explain and elucidate by them certain articles of the Romish faith. This confidence in *Aristotle* betrayed him into opinions, that were novel and strange to Romish ears; and his books were prohibited and condemned, by the congregation of the *Index* at Rome, and in some other places. He is said to have died in England, and to have founded a sect among his countrymen which time has destroyed.(212) *Joseph Francis Burrhi* or *Borrhus*, a Milanese knight, and deeply read in chymistry and medicine,—if what is reported of him be true, was not so much of an errorist as a delirious man. For the pratings attributed to him concerning the Virgin Mary, the Holy Spirit, the new celestial city which he was to found, and the destruction of the Roman pontiff, are so absurd and ridiculous, that no one can suppose him to have been of a sane mind, without showing that he himself is not so. His conduct in one place and another, shows abundantly, that he had a great deal of vanity, levity, and deception, but very little of sound reason and good sense. He once escaped from the snares of the *Inquisition*, and roamed as an exile over a considerable part of Europe, pretending to be a second *Esculapius*, and an

(211) *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire, tome iii., p. 2215, [art. *Peirere*, *Isaac*]. *Godfr. Arnold*, Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, vol. iii., ch. vii., p. 70. Menagiana; published by *Bernh. Monnoye*, tom. ii., p. 40. [The writings of *Peyrere* were: Præadamitæ, sive Exercitatio super versibus 12, 13, 14, cap. v., epist. D. Pauli ad Rom., 1655, 12mo; and Systema theolog. ex Præadamitarum hypothesi, pars i. His recantation was contained in, Is. Peyrerei epistola ad Philotimum, qua exponit rationes, propter quas ejuraverit sectam Calvini, quam profitebatur, et librum de Præadamitis, quem ediderat, Frankf., 1658, 12mo. He afterwards lived retired at Paris among the Fathers of the Oratory, and was supported by the prince of *Condé*.—*Schl.*]

(212) *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire, tome i., p. 236, [art. *Anglus*]. *Andrew Baillet*, Vie de Mr. des Cartes, tome ii., p. 245. [His real name was *Thomas White*; and he was born of a respectable family of English Catholics; but to disguise himself, he assumed various names, as *Albius*, *Candidus*, *Bianchi*, *Richworth*, &c. He was best known however, by the name of *Anglus*, i. e. *English*. Being a man of genius, and an enthusiastic Peripatetic, but possessing little solidity of judgment, he was perpetually advancing new and singular opinions, which would not bear examination. He resided in nearly every Catholic country of Europe, found reason often to change his residence, passed through various scenes, and finally died in England. He was much opposed to the philosophy of *Des Cartes*. See *Bayle*, loc. cit.—*Tr.*]

adept in the great mysteries of the chymists. But in the year 1672, he again imprudently fell into the hands of the papists, who condemned him to perpetual imprisonment.(213) A book of *Celestine Sfondrati*, in which he attempted to explain and settle in a new way the controversies respecting predestination, disturbed in 1696, a large part of the Romish church: for it did not entirely please either the Jesuits or their adversaries. And nothwithstanding he had been made a cardinal in 1646, on account of his erudition, five French bishops of the highest respectability,(214) accused him before *Innocent* XII. of several errors, among which was contempt for the opinions of *St. Augustine*. But this rising contest was cropped in the bud. The pontiff indeed promised the French, that he would submit the cause to the examination of eminent theologians, and then would decide it. But as was the Romish custom, he violated his promise and did not venture to decide the cause.(215)

§ 52. As there is little to be said of the changes or enlargement of the Romish ceremonies in this century, except that *Urban* VIII. published a Bull in 1643, for diminishing the number of feast-days;(216) I shall conclude the chapter, with a list of those who were canonized or enrolled among the tutelar divinities, by the decision of the sovereign pontiffs, during the century. *Clement* VIII. pronounced worthy of this highest honour, in 1601, *Raymond of Pennafort* the noted collector of the *Decretals;* also in 1608, *Francisca de Pontianis* a Benedictine nun; and in 1610, *Charles Borromeo* a very illustrious bishop of Milan. *Gregory* XV. in the year 1622, gave *Theresia* a Carmelite nun of Avila in Spain, a place in this society. By the authority of *Urban* VIII. in 1623, *Philip Nerius* founder of the Fathers of the Oratory in Italy, *Ignatius Loyola* the father of the Jesuits, and *Francis Xavier*, one of Loyola's first disciples and the apostle of the Indies, were elevated to this high rank. *Alexander* VII. in 1658, added *Thomas de Vilanova* a Spanish Augustinian, and in 1665, *Francis de Sales* bishop of Geneva, to the intercessors with God. *Clement* X. joined with them in 1670, *Peter de Alcantara* a Franciscan, and *Maria Magdalena de Pactiis* a Florentine Carmelitess; and the next year, 1671, *Rose*, an American

(213) *Bayle*, Dictionnaire, tome i., p. 609, [art. *Borri*]. *Godfr. Arnold*, Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. iii., ch. xviii., p. 193, and others.

(214) [They were *Pellier*, archbishop of Rheims, *Noailles*, archbishop of Paris, *Bossuet*, bishop of Meaux, *Guy de Seve*, bishop of Arras, and *Feydeau*, bishop of Amiens.—*Tr.*]

(215) The book was entitled: Nodus prædestinationis dissolutus; Rome, 1696, 4to. The letter of the French bishops, and the answer of the pontiff, are given by *Charles du Plessis d'Argentre*, Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, tom. iii., pt. ii., p 394, &c., and by *Natalis Alexander*, Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis, p. 877, &c. The letter of the bishops is remarkable, as containing censures of the Jesuits and their doctrines, and not merely of their doctrine of *philosophical sin*, but also of their procedure in China; indeed, they say that *Sfondrati* had taught worse doctrine, than even the *Molinists*. The opinions of *Sfondrati* are neatly stated, and compared with those of *Augustine*, by *Jac. Basnage*, Histoire de l'Eglise, livr xii., cap. iii., § 11, p. 713, &c. —[He taught, 1. That God sincerely and strongly desires the salvation of all men.—2. That he gives to all men gracious aid, not only sufficient but even more than sufficient for its attainment.—3. That God does not withhold his grace from the worst and most obstinate sinners; but sets before them incipient aid, by using which they might easily obtain the more powerful grace of God.—4. That, still there remains something dark and unfathomable in the doctrine of election.—*Schl.*]

(216) This memorable bull of *Urban* is extant in the Nouvelle Bibliotheque, tome xv., p. 88, &c., [and in the Magnum Bullarium Cherubini, tom. v., p. 378, dated on the Ides of September, 1642.—*Tr.*]

nun of the third order of Dominicians, and *Lewis Bertrand* a Spanish Dominican who had been a missionary in America; and death alone prevented his adding to these *Cajetan Thienæus* a Regular Clerk of Vicenza. He was therefore enrolled among the celestial ministers in 1691, by *Innocent* XII.; who also in the same year, publicly decreed the same honours to *John of Leon* in Spain, an Eremite of St. Augustine, to *Paschal Baylonius* a Franciscan monk of Aragon, and to *John de Dieu* (*de Deo*), a Portuguese, and one of the Brethren of Hospitality; for all of whom, this honour had been designed before by Alexander VIII.(217.)

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE GREEK AND ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

§ 1. State of the Greek Church.—§ 2. Cyrillus Lucaris. Hope of a Union of the Greeks and Latins disappointed.—§ 3. Whether the latter corrupted the Religion of the former.—§ 4. The Russian Church. The Roskolski.—§ 5. Revolution in it.—§ 6. State of the Monophysites.—§ 7. The Armenians.—§ 8. The Nestorians.

§ 1. Many things perhaps occur among the Greek and other Oriental Christians, which are neither uninteresting nor unimportant; but the transactions in those countries are but rarely reported to us, and still more rarely are they reported truly, or undisguised either with the colourings of party feelings or the fabulous tales of the vulgar. We have therefore not much to say here. The Greeks in this century, as in the preceding, were in a miserable state, afflicted, uncultivated, and destitute of the means of acquiring a sound knowledge of religious subjects. This however, is true only of the Greeks in general or as a body. For who will have the folly to deny, that among an immense multitude of people, some of whom often visit Sicily, Venice, Rome, England, Holland, and Germany, and many carry on a successful commerce, and some are advanced to the highest employments in the Turkish court, there can be found individuals here and there who are neither poor, nor stupid, nor wholly illiterate, nor destitute of refinement, nor in fine sunk in superstition, vice, and profligacy?(1)

(217) The bulls of the pontiffs, by which these men and women were enrolled in the College of the *Divi*, are mentioned and retailed in their order, by *Justus Fontaninus*, in the Codex constitutionum, quas summi Pontifices ediderunt in solemni Canonizatione Sanctorum, p. 260, &c., Rome, 1729, fol. [And all of them, except that of *Alexander* VII. for the canonization of *Francis de Sales*, are given at large, in the Magnum Bullarium Cherubini, tom. iii., p. 126, 262, 287, 465, tom iv., p. 12, and Append., p. 1, tom. vi., p. 76, 288, 347, and Append, p. 3, 17, tom. vii., p. 115, 120, 125, tom. xi., p. 1, tom. xii., p. 78.—*Tr.*] As they recite the grounds on which the persons were judged worthy of canonization, these bulls afford very ample matter for the discussion of a sagacious person. Nor would it be a vain or useless labour, for such a one to examine, without superstition, yet with candour, into the justice, the piety, and the truth of those grounds.

(1) This remark is made, on account of *Alexander Helladius*, and others who think with him. There is extant, a book of *Helladius*, entitled the Present State of the Greek church, printed in 1714, 8vo, in which he bitterly declaims against the most meritorious and learned writers on Grecian affairs; and maintains, that his countrymen are much more pious, learned, wise, and happy, than is commonly supposed. We by no means envy the Greeks the portion of happiness

Their inveterate hatred of the Latins could in no way be expelled from their minds, nor even be moderated, although the Roman pontiffs and their numerous missionaries to the Greeks, spared neither ingenuity nor treasure, to gain the confidence and affections of that people.(2) The Latin teachers have indeed collected some little and poor congregations in certain islands in the Archipelago; but neither the Greeks, nor their masters the Turks, will allow the Latins to attempt any thing more.

§ 2. In the pontificate of *Urban* VIII. the Latins conceived great hopes, that they should find the Greek and Oriental Christians more tractable in future.(3) The pontiff made it one of his most assiduous cares, to effect the difficult design of subjecting the Oriental Christians, and especially the Greeks, to the dominion of the Romish see; and he called in the aid of men who were best acquainted with the opinions of the Greeks and the eastern Christians, to point out to him the plainest and shortest method of accomplishing the object. The wisest of these were of opinion, that those Christians should be allowed to retain nearly all their long-established peculiarities both of rites and of doctrine, which the Latin doctors had formerly deemed insufferable: for rites, said they, do not appertain to the essence of religion, and their doctrines should be so explained and understood as to appear to differ as little as possible from the opinions and institutions of the Latins; because those Christians would feel less repugnance to union, if they could be persuaded that they had long been Romanists, and that the pontiffs did not require them to abandon the principles of their fathers but only to understand them correctly. Hence arose those erudite works, composed however with little ingenuousness, published by *Leo Allatius*, *John Morin*, *Clement Galanus*, *Lucas Holstenius*, *Abraham Echellensis*,(4) and others; in which they

they may enjoy; nay, we wish them far more than they possess. Yet we could show if it were necessary, from the very statements *Helladius* gives us, that the condition of the Greeks is no better, than it is generally supposed to be; notwithstanding all persons and places are not equally sunk in barbarism, superstition, and knavery. See the remarks above, on the history of the Oriental church, in the sixteenth century.

(2) What number of missions there are in Greece and in the other countries subject to the Turkish government, and what is their present condition, is fully stated by the Jesuit *Tarillon*, in his letter to Ponchartrain, sur l'état présent des Missions des Peres Jesuites dans la Grece; which is extant in the Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus, tome i., p. 1125, [and in the Lettres Edifiantes, &c., ed. 1819, tom. i., p. 1, &c.—*Tr.*] On the state of the Romish religion in the islands of the Archipelago, see *Jac. Xavier Portier*, in a letter printed in the Letters édifiantes et curieuses écrites des Missions étrangéres, tome x., p. 328, [ed. 1819, tome i., p. 283, &c.—*Tr.*] The high colouring of these statements, may be easily corrected, by the many accounts of the Catholic and other writers in our own age, respecting the affairs of the Greeks. See, above all others, *Richard Simon* or *Sainiore's* Bibliotheque Critique, tome i., cap. xxiii., p. 340; who in p. 346, well confirms, among other things, that which we have observed from *Urban Cerri*; namely, that none oppose and resist the Latins with more vehemence, than the Greeks who have been educated at Rome, or trained in other schools of the Latins. He says: Ils sont les primiers à crier contre et à medire du Pape et des Latins. Ces pelerins Orienteaux qui viennent chez nous, fourbent et abusent de nôtre credulité pour acheter un benefice et tourmenter les Missioneres Latins, &c. The most recent and most full testimony to the invincible hatred of the Greeks against the Latins, is given by *John Covell*, Account of the present Greek church; Preface, p. ix., &c.; Cambridge, 1722, fol.

(3) See *Jo. Morin's* Life, prefixed to his Antiquitates ecclesiæ Orientalis, p. 37–46.

(4) The work of *Leo Allatius*, de Concordia ecclesiæ Orientalis et Occidentalis, is well known; and the most learned men among both the Lutherans and the Reformed, with the greatest justice charge it with bad faith. He also published his *Græcia Orthodoxa*, Rome, 1652 and 1659, 4to. which contains those tracts of the Greeks which fa-

undertook to prove, that there was little or no difference between the religion of the Greeks, Armenians, and Nestorians, and that of the Romans, provided we set aside a few rites and certain unusual words and phrases adopted by those foreign Christians. No one more firmly resisted this project of uniting the Greeks with the Latins, than *Cyrillus Lucaris* patriarch of Constantinople, a learned man who had travelled over a great part of Europe. For he signified clearly,—indeed more clearly than was prudent, that his mind was inclined towards the religious opinions of the English and the Dutch, and that he contemplated a reformation of the ancient religion of the Greeks. The Jesuits, aided by the influence of the French ambassador and by the knavery of certain perfidious Greeks, vigorously opposed this powerful adversary for a long time, and in various ways, and at length vanquished him. For they caused him to be accused before the Turkish emperor, of the crimes of treason and rebellion ; on which charge he was strangled in the year 1638.(5) This great man was succeeded by one

voured the Latins. From the pen of *Lucas Holstenius*, who was far superior to *Allatius* in learning and ingenuousness, we have only two Dissertations, de ministro et forma sacramenti confirmationis apud Græcos ; which were published after his death, Rome, 1666, 8vo. The very learned works of *John Morin*, de Pœnitentia, and de Ordinationibus, are well known by the learned : and every one that peruses them can see, that the author aims to evince that there is a wonderful agreement, on these subjects, between the Christians of the East and the Latins, provided the thorny subtilities of the Scholastics are kept out of sight. *Clemens Galanus*, in a prolix and elaborate work, published at Rome in 1650, [1690, 2 vols.] fol., laboured to prove, that the Armenians differ but little from the Latins. *Abraham Echellensis*, both elsewhere and in his Notes to *Hebed Jesu's* Catalogus librorum Chaldaicorum, maintains that all the Christians throughout Asia and Africa, coincide with the Latin church. Other writers on this subject, are passed over. [Among these were *Fred. Spanheim's* Diss. de Ecclesiæ Græciæ et Orientalis à Romana Papali perpetua dissensione ; in his Opp., tom. ii., p. 485, &c , and *Ja. Elsner's* latest account of the Greek Christians in Turkey, ch. v. (in German). —*Schl.*]

(5) There is extant a Confession of faith drawn up by *Cyrillus Lucaris*, and repeatedly published, particularly in Holland, 1645, 8vo, from which it clearly appears, that he favoured the Reformed religion more than that of his countrymen. It was published among *Jac. Aymon's* Monumens authentiques de la religion des Grecs, p. 237. Yet he was not averse from the Lutherans, for he addressed letters about this time to the Swedes, whose friendship he endeavoured to conciliate. See *Arkenholtz's* Mémoires de la Reine Christine, tome i., p. 486, and tome ii., Append. Documents, 113, &c. The same *Aymon* has published twenty-seven Letters of this prelate, addressed to the Genevans and to others professing the Reformed religion ; ubi supra, p. 1–199, which more fully exhibit his disposition and his religious opinions. The life and the unhappy death of this in various respects extraordinary man, are described by *Thomas Smith*, an Englishman, in his Narratio de vita, studiis, gestis et martyrio Cyrilli Lucaris ; which is inserted in his Miscellanea, London, 1686, 8vo, p. 49–130 ; also by *Jo. Henry Hottinger*, Analecta Historico-Theol., Appendix, diss. viii., p. 550, and by others, whom *Jo. Alb. Fabricius* has enumerated, Bibliotheca Græca, vol. x., p. 499. [*Cyrillus Lucaris* was born in 1572, in Candia the ancient Crete, then subject to the Venetians. Possessing fine native talents, he first studied at Venice and Padua, and then travelled over Italy and other countries. Disgusted with the Romish religion, and charmed with that of the Reformed, he resided a while at Geneva. On his return to Greece, he connected himself with his countryman *Meletius Piga*, bishop of Alexandria, who resided much at Constantinople and was often legate to the patriarch. *Cyril* became his chaplain, and then his Achimandrite. The efforts of the Romanists in 1595, to gain the Russian and Polish Greek churches, were resisted at Constantinople, and *Cyril* was active in opposing the defection. His efforts in this cause, exposed him to the resentments of the Polish government ; and in 1600, he had to quit that country. He went to Alexandria, was there highly respected, and on the death of *Meletius* in 1602, he succeeded him in that see. He now kept up a correspondence with several Reformed divines ; and among them, with *Geo. Abbot* archbishop of

who had been the principal assistant to the Jesuits in his destruction, namely, *Cyril* of Berrhœa, a man of a malignant and violent temper: and as he apostatized to the Romish religion, the union of the Greeks and Latins seemed no longer dubious.(6) But the unhappy fate of *Cyril*, suddenly dissipated this hope. For in a little more than a year, this great friend of the Roman pontiff was put to death, in the same manner as his enemy before had been; and *Parthenius*, who bore the hereditary hostility of his nation to the Latins, was placed at the head of the Greek church. From this time onward, no good opportunity was found by the Romans, either for assailing the Greek patriarchs, or for drawing them over to their interests.

§ 3. Yet very many complain, and none more than the Reformed, that the flatteries, the sophistry, and the gold, both of the French ambassadors in Turkey and of the Jesuits, have had so much effect of late upon the ignorance and the poverty of the Greek bishops, that they have departed from the religion of their fathers in several respects, and especially on the doctrine of the eucharist; and have adopted among other errors of the Latins, the inexplicable doctrine of transubstantiation. And this they say, was especially done in the celebrated council of Jerusalem, which *Dosi-*

Canterbury. It was at this time, that he sent to England the celebrated Alexandrine Codex of the Bible, containing *St. Clement's* Epistle to the Corinthians. His aversion to the Romish church, drew on him the hatred and persecution of the Jesuits, and of all in the East who favoured the Romish cause. In 1612, he was at Constantinople, and the Romish interest alone prevented his election to the patriarchal chair. He retired to Alexandria; but in 1621, he was elected to the see of Constantinople, in spite of the Romish opposition. But his persecutors never ceased to traduce him, and to plot against him. He was moreover too far in advance of the Greeks, to be popular with the multitude; and the Turkish government would at any time depose a patriarch and admit a new one, for a few thousand dollars. In 1622, he was banished to Rhodes, and *Gregory* of Amasa purchased the office for 20,000 dollars; but not having the money on hand, he also was sent away, and *Anthimus* bishop of Adrianople, having money, purchased the office. But the Greeks would not submit to him, and he was obliged to resign to *Cyril*, who was restored, on paying a large sum for the privilege. The Romanists still plotted against him. He sent a Greek to London, to learn the art of printing and to procure a printing press. On its arrival, his enemies charged him with employing it for political purposes, and caused him great trouble; though the English and Dutch ambassadors interposed in his behalf. In 1629, having a little respite, he called a council of Greeks, to reform that church: and here he proposed his Confession of faith, which was adopted. In 1633, *Cyrillus Contari*, bishop of Berrhœa, the personal enemy of *Cyril Lucaris*, and supported by the Romish party, bargained with the Turks for the patriarchal chair: but being unable to pay the money down, he was exiled to Tenedos, and *Lucaris* retained the office. The next year *Athanasius* of Thessalonica paid the Turks 60.000 dollars for the office; and *Lucaris* was again banished. But at the end of a month, he was recalled and reinstated, on his paying 10.000 dollars. But now *Cyril Contari* had raised his 50,000 dollars; and *Cyril Lucaris* was banished to Rhodes, to make way for him. After six months, his friends purchased his restoration. But in 1638, he was falsely accused of treason, in the absence of the emperor, who upon the representation of his vizier, gave orders for his death. He was seized, conveyed on board a ship as if for banishment; and as soon as the vessel was at sea, he was strangled and thrown overboard. His body drifted ashore, and was buried by his friends. See *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. v., p. 394, &c., and Unpartheyische Kirchenhistorie, Jena, 1735, vol. ii., p. 255, &c.—*Tr.*]

(6) See *Elias Veicl's* Defensio exercitationis de ecclesia Græca, p. 100, &c., in which, p. 103, is a letter of *Urban* VIII. to this *Cyril* of Berrhœa, highly commending him for having successfully averted from the Greeks the pernicious errors of *Lucaris*, and exhorting him to depose the bishops that were opposed to the Latins, with the promise of aid both from Rome and from the Spanish government. This *Cyril* died a member of the Romish church. *Henry Hilarius*, Notes to Phil. Cyprii Chronicon ecclesiæ Græcæ, p. 470.

theus assembled in the year 1672.(7) This charge, whether it be true or false, was first advanced upon occasion of a dispute between the papists and the Reformed in France. The latter, at the head of whom was the very eloquent and erudite *John Claude*, maintained that many opinions of the Romanists, and especially that which asserts that the bread and the wine in the eucharist are so changed into the body and blood of Christ as still to leave the external appearance of bread and wine, were wholly unknown in ancient times, and were not found among the Latins themselves before the ninth century: the Catholics on the contrary, *Anthony Arnaud* and his associates, in managing the cause contended, that the Romish belief respecting the Lord's supper had been the received opinion among Christians in every age; and that it was approved by all the sects of Christians in the East, particularly by the Greeks.(8) This controversy required authorities and testimonies. Hence the French envoys at Constantinople with the Jesuits, on the one part, and the Dutch and English ministers on the other, laboured indefatigably to collect opinions of the Greeks in favour of their respective sides. It so happened that the Romanists were superior in both the number and weight of their testimonies; but the Reformed contended, that all these were of no avail, being either purchased of the starving Greeks with money, or obtained from persons either ignorant on the subject, or deceived and ensnared by insidious language.(9) Whoever shall bring to the decision of this controversy a good acquaintance with Grecian affairs, and a mind unbiased by prejudice, will judge, I apprehend, that no small part of the Greek church had for many ages possessed some obscure idea of *transubstantiation*, but that they received more clear and explicit ideas of it, in modern times, from the Romans.(10)

§ 4. Of the independent Greek churches, or those not subject to the Byzantine patriarch, the Russian is the only one that affords any matter for history; the others lie buried in vast ignorance and darkness. About the year 1666, a certain sect showed itself among the Russians, and produced no little commotion, which called itself *Isbraniki*, or the *company of the elect*, but by its adversaries it was called *Roskolskika*, that is, the *seditious faction*.(11) What these find to censure in the modern Russian church, and

(7) The proceedings of this council were published, after an edition by a French Benedictine, by *Jac. Aymon*, Monumens Authentiques de la religion des Grecs, tome i., p. 263. See *Gisbert Cuper's* Epistolæ, p. 404, 407. Notes illustrative of it, may be seen, besides other places, in *Jac. Basnage's* Histoire de la religion des Eglises Reformées, period iv., pt. i., cap. xxxii., &c., p. 452, and in *Jo. Cowell's* Account of the present Greek Church, book i., ch. v., p. 136, &c. [See also Thom. Ittig's Heptad. Dissertat., No. v. de Synodo Hierosol.—*Schl.* The Acts of this council, Gr. and Lat., are in Harduin's Concilia, tom. xii., p. 179, &c.—*Tr.*]

(8) The names and works of the principal writers on this controversy, may be learned from *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Bibliotheca Græca, vol. x., p. 444, &c., and *Christopher Matth. Pfaff*, Dissertatio contra Ludov. Rogerii Opus Eucharisticum, Tubing., 1718, 4to.

(9) Here should be consulted, above all others, *John Cowell*, who was resident at Constantinople when this drama was acted, and himself saw by what artifices the Greeks were induced to give testimony in favour of the Latins: Account of the present Greek Church, pref., p. ii., &c., and book i., ch. v., p. 136, &c.

(10) *Maturin Viesse la Croze*, who is well known to have been by no means partial to the Jesuits and to Romish opinions, supposed that the Greeks had long been infected with the doctrine of *transubstantiation*. See *Gisb. Cuper's* Epistolæ, edited by Beyer, p. 37, 44, 48, 51, 65. [See also *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. ix., p. 102.—*Tr.*]

(11) Perhaps these are the very persons,

what opinions and rites they hold, is not yet fully known. It appears however, in general, that they distinguish themselves by a great show of piety, and represent the ancient religion of the Russians as much marred, partly by the negligence and partly by the licentiousness of the bishops.(12) The Russians long assailed this factious throng, with councils, confutations, very harsh punishments, military force, and flatteries; but the effect of all these remedies was, to drive them to more remote regions, and as is usual, to render them more pertinacious in consequence of their calamities and sufferings. A milder treatment began to be shown them, from the time that *Peter* I., whose achievements procured him the surname of *Great*, introduced a material change in both the civil and ecclesiastical government of the empire. But the schism is so far from being healed, that this revolution in the Russian affairs, is said rather to have added firmness and stability to it.

whom the celebrated *Gmelin*, in his Travels in Siberia, (in German, vol. iv., p. 404), calls *Sterowerzi*. [They doubtless come under this denomination; for *Robert Pinkerton* (Present state of the Greek church in Russia, Appendix, p. 227), tells us: "The national church in Russia gives the general name of *Raskolniks*, or Schismatics, to *all* the sects which have at different periods renounced her communion; but these separatists uniformly style themselves *Starovertsi*, or *Believers of the old faith*."—*Tr.*]

(12) See *Nic. Bergius*, de statu ecclesiæ et religionis Moscoviticæ, sec. xi., cap. vii., p. 69. Add sec. ii., cap. xvi., p. 218, and in the Append., p. 270. *Jo. Mich. Heineccius* on the Greek Church, (written in German), pt. iii., p. 30, &c. *Peter Van Haven's* Travels in Russia, p. 316 of the German translation. Some Lutheran writers have supposed or suspected, that these *Isbraniki* were a progeny of the ancient *Bogomils*. [*Dr. Mosheim's* account of the Russian dissenters is very lame. See the whole Appendix to *Rob. Pinkerton's* Present state of the Greek church in Russia, ed. New-York, 1815, p. 227–276. He tells us, it is common to date the origin of sectarians in the Russian church, about the middle of the 17th century, in the time of the patriarch *Nikon*. But according to the Russian annals, there existed schismatics in the Russian church two hundred years before the days of *Nikon;* and the disturbances which took place in his time, only proved the means of augmenting their numbers, and of bringing them forward into public view. The earliest of these schismatics first appeared in Novogorod, early in the 15th century, under the name of *Strigolniks*. A Jew named *Horie*, preached a mixture of Judaism and Christianity; and proselyted two priests, *Denis* and *Alexie*, who gained a vast number of followers. This sect was so numerous, that a national council was called towards the close of the 15th century, to oppose it. Soon afterwards, one *Karp*, an excommunicated deacon, joined the Strigolniks; and accused the higher clergy of selling the office of priesthood, and of so far corrupting the church that the Holy Ghost was withdrawn from it. He was a very successful propagator of this sect. But numerous as the Strigolniks were, they were few compared with the vast number and variety of sectarians, produced by the attempts to correct the copies of the Russian liturgy, or books used in the churches, which amount to twenty folio volumes. These having long been preserved by transcription, were found to contain numerous mistakes of transcribers, and to differ greatly from each other. The higher clergy and the princes, as early as 1518, attempted to correct these books, and bring them all to agreement. And the object was pursued for more than a century, amid great opposition, before it was fully accomplished. The great body of the Raskolniks or dissenters, though divided into various sects, yet all agree with one another and with the national church, in articles of faith, and generally in rites and modes of worship; but they consider the national church as corrupt, because it has falsified the sacred books, and thus subverted religion. There are however, some minor sects, which differ from the establishment both in faith and worship. *Pinkerton* divides them into two grand classes, the *Popopftschins*, or those who admit the national priests that apostatize to them to officiate still as priests, without reordination; and the *Bezpopoftschins*, or those who either have no priests, or have only such as they themselves ordain. Of the former class, he enumerates *five* sects, and of the latter *fifteen*. But the history of these sects more properly belongs to the following century. See also *Stæudlin's* Kirchliche Geographie, vol. i., p. 289, &c.—*Tr.*]

§ 5. It will not be improper here, to subjoin a few remarks respecting that reformation of the Russian church by *Peter* I. which we have just mentioned. For though it belongs to the following century, yet the foundations for it were laid in the close of this. That immortal prince suffered the Greek religion as professed by the Russians, to remain entire; but he took vast pains, to have it explained according to sound reason and the holy scriptures, to destroy that superstition which was diffused greatly over the whole nation, and to dispel the amazing ignorance both of the priests and the common people. These were great and noble designs, but exceedingly difficult and such as often require ages for their accomplishment. To effect them the more readily, he became the patron of all the arts and sciences, invited learned men from all quarters into the country, established new schools and purged the old ones of their barbarism, laboured to enkindle in his subjects a thirst for learning of all kinds and for literature, abolished the iniquitous practice of persecuting and punishing errorists, and granted to all Christian sects dissenting from the Greeks, full liberty to worship according to their own views. Yet in the last particular, he was careful to restrain the eagerness of the Romanists for extending the dominion of their pontiff. They had certain places assigned them, in which if they chose to reside among the Russians, they might worship in their way. But the Jesuits were prohibited from teaching among the Russian people; and the council that controls all matters of religion, was directed to see that Romish opinions were not propagated among the people. All ecclesiastical affairs are managed, very differently from what they were formerly. For the emperor suppressed the splendid office of primate, because it was thought prejudicial to the sovereignty of the prince, and made himself sovereign pontiff and head of the Russian church.(13) His vicegerent [in ecclesiastical affairs] is a council established at St. Petersburg, called the *Holy Synod*, over which some *archbishop* of distinguished prudence and fidelity, presides.(14) The first that filled this office, was the celebrated *Stephen Javorski*, well known by his work in the Russian language against heretics.(15) The other ecclesiastical offices remain as before; but they are deprived of much of the authority formerly annexed to them, and of no small part of their revenues and privileges. At first it was intended to suppress all monasteries, whether for men or

(13) [*Dr. Maclaine* very justly criticises the language here used by *Dr. Mosheim*; which implies that the emperor assumed a *spiritual office* and *spiritual power*. He only claimed the right as *emperor*, to receive appeals from the ecclesiastical courts, and to give law to priests as well as to the rest of his subjects. He was head of the church, in much the same sense as the kings of England and the German princes are; none of whom ever presumed to administer the sacraments, or to perform any appropriate functions of a clergyman or priest.—*Tr.*]

(14) [This is not perfectly correct. In the year 1700, *Peter* abolished the patriarchal office, and appointed an *exarch*, with limited powers, who could do nothing without the consent of the other bishops, and was obliged to refer all affairs of moment to the decision of the *Czar* himself. Such was *Stephen Javorski*, mentioned in the next sentence. But in 1720, Peter abolished the exarchy also, and in place of it, instituted the *Holy Legislative Synod*, consisting first of twelve, and afterwards of an indefinite number of the higher clergy, selected by the emperor. At the head of this synod there is always a layman, who is the representative of the Czar, and has a negative upon all its resolutions, till they are laid before the emperor. This nobleman is the minister of the crown for the department of religion. See *Pinkerton*, loc. cit., p. 26, &c., and *Stœudlin's* Kirchliche Geographie, vol. i., p. 269, &c.—*Tr.*]

(15) See *Mich. le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. i., p. 1295

for women. But from this design the emperor so far departed afterwards, that he himself dedicated a magnificent house of this kind to *Alexander Newsky*, whom the Russians number among their saints.(16)

§ 6. A part of the *Asiatic Monophysites* left for a time the religion of their fathers, and united themselves with the Romanists. Their prompter to this measure, was one *Andrew Achigian*, who had been educated at Rome, was appointed *patriarch* by the Roman pontiff, and assumed the name of *Ignatius* XXIV.(17) At his death, one *Peter*, who took the name of *Ignatius* XXV., assumed the office: but at the instigation of the legitimate primate of the sect, he was banished by the Turks, and the little flock of which he was the head was soon dispersed.(18) Of the *African Monophysites*, the *Copts* notwithstanding their wretchedness, ignorance, and poverty, firmly resisted the persons, who so often solicited them with very advantageous offers to become united with the Romans. In what manner the *Abyssinians* freed themselves from the yoke of the Romish bishop, which they had indiscreetly assumed, and asserted their ancient independence, has already been stated. And it will now be proper to add, that in some of the Lutherans a holy desire arose, to deliver the Abyssinian nation from the darkness of ignorance and superstition, and to bring them to a better knowledge of religion. Prompted by such motives, *Peter Heyling* of Lubec, a very pious and learned man, visited them in the year 1634: and after spending many years in Ethiopia, and being so prosperous as to become prime minister of state to the emperor, and having accomplished much for the advantage of the people, on his return to Europe he lost his life by means unknown.(19) Afterwards, *Ernest* duke of Saxe-Gotha, whose exemplary virtue procured him the surname of *Pious*, at the suggestion and recommendation of that extraordinary man *Job Lu-*

(16) On these subjects much information may be obtained from *Peter van Haven's* Travels in Russia; which are extant in a German translation from the Danish.

(17) From the 15th century onward, all the primates of the Monophysite sect chose to bear the name of *Ignatius*; for no other reason, if I do not mistake, than to indicate by their name that they are successors to *Ignatius* the bishop of Antioch in the first century, and the legitimate *patriarchs* of that see. A similar motive has induced the Maronite primates, who also claim the title of patriarchs of Antioch, to assume the name of *Peter*. For *St. Peter* is said to have governed the church of Antioch, before *Ignatius*.

(18) See *Jo. Simon Assemani's* Biblioth. Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana, tom. ii., p. 482, and in Diss. de Monophysitis, § iii., p. 6, 7.

(19) A valuable life of this man, was published in German, by *Jo. Henry Michaelis*, Halle, 1724, 8vo. Add *Jo. Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. i., p 253, &c. [His father was a jeweller of Lubec. After a good education in his native city, he went to Paris in 1627, having charge of four noble youth. There he became intimate with *Hugo Grotius*. From Paris he went to Italy, and thence to Malta, where he disputed with the Catholic priests. He now assumed the garb of a pilgrim, intending to travel into the East and acquaint himself with Oriental literature. He proceeded to Constantinople, and thence to Palestine and Egypt. He arrived in Egypt in 1634, and so recommended himself to the Copts, by his learning and his piety, that they esteemed him highly, and gave him the title of *Moollah*. Meeting with the new primate of Ethiopia, who had come to Alexandria for ordination, he joined him; and on their way to Abyssinia, they met *Mendez* the Portuguese Jesuit, just banished from that country, whom *Heyling* encountered and confuted in a public dispute. *Mendez* wrote to the pope, that if this Lutheran should go into Abyssinia, he would involve that whole nation in extreme heresy. He arrived there in 1634, and was very popular and useful. But how long he lived, and where he died, is very uncertain. A letter of his to *H. Grotius*, dated at Memphis, Aug. 28, 1634, respecting the disputes between the Melchites and the Jacobites, is extant in *Ludolf's* Comment. ad Hist. Æthiop., lib. iii., c. 8. See *Möller*, loc. cit.—*Tr.*]

Iolf, attempted to explore a way for teachers of the Reformed religion to go among those distant Christians, by means of *Gregory*, an Abyssinian who was then in Europe.(20) But *Gregory* perishing by shipwreck in 1657, *Ernest* sent *Jo. Mich. Wansleben* of Erfurth, in 1663, with very wise instructions, to conciliate if possible the good will of the Abyssinians towards the Germans. *Wansleben* however, lingered in Egypt; and upon his return, not being able to account for the moneys he had received, he revolted to the Romish church in 1667, and became a Dominican monk.(21) Thus the designs of this excellent duke were frustrated: yet they were attended with this advantage, that *Job Ludolf* by his very learned and elaborate works, threw much light upon the history, the sentiments, and the literature of the Abyssinians, which before had been but little known among the Europeans.

§ 7. A considerable change took place in the affairs of the Armenians, not long after the commencement of this century, originating from *Abbas* I. the king of Persia, who for his achievements was surnamed the *Great*. For he nearly laid waste all that part of Armenia which was contiguous to Persia, with a view to prevent the Turks from invading his territories; and he caused most of its inhabitants to migrate and settle in Persia. For what the Europeans endeavour to accomplish by erecting castles and fortresses along their borders, the kings of the East prefer to effect by depopulating the frontier parts and provinces of their kingdoms. The richest and best of these Armenians removed to *Ispahan*, the capital of the kingdom, and took residence in the splendid suburb which the king called *Julfa*, where they have their own bishop. So long as *Abbas* lived, who was a magnanimous prince and much attached to his people, these exiles enjoyed great prosperity; but after his death, they were involved in calamities and persecutions.(22) And hence, not a few of them have apostatized to Mohammedanism; and it is to be feared, that this portion of the Armenian church will become wholly extinct. On the other hand, the Asiatic

(20) See *Job Ludolf's* Preface to his Comment. ad Hist. Æthiopicam, p. 31, &c. *Christ. Juncker's* Vita Jobi Ludolfi, p. 68, &c. [*Ludolf* became acquainted with this *Gregory*, during his tour to Rome, and invited him into Germany. He resided a while at the court of Gotha; but afterwards was desirous of returning to his country; and on his way, at Alexandretta in Syria, lost his life by shipwreck.—*Schl.*]

(21) Concerning this unstable and vicious but learned man, much may be collected from *Jerome Lobo's* Voyage de l'Abyssinie, tome i., p. 198, 227, 233, 248. *Ern. Solom. Cyprian's* Catalogus MSS. Bibliothecæ Gothanæ, p. 64. *Euseb. Renaudot*, Præf. ad Historiam Patriarchar. Alexandrinorum. *Jac. Echard* and *Quetif*, Scriptores Ordinis Prædicat., tom. ii., p. 693. We have his Historia ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ, and other works, which are not without merit. [The patriarch of Alexandria persuaded him not to prosecute his journey into Abyssinia. After changing his religion at Rome, he went to Paris, whence *Colbert* in the year 1672 sent him again to Egypt, to procure a fuller account of the state of that country, and to purchase rare manuscripts for the king's library. But *Colbert* seemed dissatisfied with his proceedings. For *Wansleben* was not in the least respected at Paris; and from vexation, he assumed in 1678 the vicarage of a village not far from Fontainbleau; and died in 1679, in the curacy of Bouron, where he was also vicar. Before his journey to Egypt, at *Ludolf's* request he went to London, to superintend there the printing of the first edition of his Ethiopic Grammar and Lexicon in 1661: and there he aided *Edm. Castell*, in the preparation of his Lexicon Heptaglosson. After his return from the East, he wrote his Relatione dello Stato presente dell' Egitto; and in 1677, his Nouvelle Relation en forme de Journal de son voyage faite en Egypte. His History of the church of Alexandria, was also published in French.—*Schl.*]

(22) See *Jo. Chardin*, Voyage en Perse, tom. ii., p. 106, &c. *Gabr. du Chinon*, Nouvelles Relations du Levant, p. 206, &c.

Armenians have undoubtedly derived no little advantage from the permanent settlement of very many of their nation during this century, for commercial purposes, in most of the countries of Europe, as at Marseilles in France, and in London, Amsterdam, and Venice.(23) For not to mention other things, this has afforded them an opportunity to print the Bible, and many other books especially religious books, in the Armenian character, in Holland particularly and in England; and these books, being sent to the Armenians living under the Persians and Turks, doubtless tend to prevent the nation which is rude and inclined to superstition, from losing all knowledge of the Christian religion.

§ 8. The disunion among the Nestorians, which rent that church in the preceding century, could not be healed at all in this. Among the patriarchs of Mosul, *Elias* II. sent his envoy to Rome in the year 1607, and again in the year 1610, to obtain the friendship of the pontiff; and in a letter to *Paul* V. he avowed himself ready to sanction a union between the Nestorians and the Romans.(24) *Elias* III. though at first extremely averse to the Romish rites, yet in the year 1657 addressed a letter to the Congregation de propaganda fide, signifying his willingness to join the Romish church, provided the pontiffs would grant to the Nestorians a place of worship at Rome, and would not corrupt or disturb at all the tenets of the sect.(25) But the Romans doubtless perceived, that a union formed on the terms here stated, would be of no use or advantage to their cause: for we have no information, that the Nestorians were at that time received into the Romish communion, or that the prelates of Mosul afterwards were again solicitous to conciliate the Roman pontiff. The Nestorian patriarchs of Ormus, who all bore the name of *Simeon*, likewise made two proposals in 1619 and 1653, for renewing their former alliance with the Roman pontiffs, and sent to Rome a tract explanatory of their religious sentiments. But either these prelates did not offer satisfactory terms to the Romans,(26) or, on account of their poverty and very slender power, they were despised at Rome: for it appears that from the year 1617, the prelates at Ormus were in a very low state, and no longer excited the envy of those at Mosul.(27) There was however, a little poor congregation of Roman Catholics formed among the Nestorians, about the middle of this century; whose bishops or patriarchs reside in the city of Amida or Diarbekir, and all bear the name of Joseph.(28) The Nestorians inhabiting the coast of Malabar, and who are called Christians of St. Thomas, so long as the Portuguese possessed those regions were miserably harassed by the Romish priests, especially by the Jesuits; and yet no vexations, nor menaces, nor artifices, could bring them all to prefer the Romish wor-

(23) Of the Armenians residing at Marseilles, and the books they have printed there, see *Rich. Simon's* Lettres Choisies, tom. ii., p. 137. Of their Bible printed in Holland, he likewise treats, ibid., tome iv., p. 160. So also does *Jo. Joach. Schrœder*, in his Thesaurus linguæ Armenicæ; or rather in the Diss. de lingua Armenica, which is prefixed to this Thesaurus, cap. iv., p. 60. The other Armenian books printed at Venice, Lemburg, and especially at Amsterdam, are enumerated by this very learned man, loc. cit., cap. ii., § xxv., &c., p. 38, &c.

(24) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana, tom. i., p. 543; tom. ii., p. 457; tom iii., part i., p. 650.

(25) *Asseman*, loc. cit., tom. iii., part ii., p. cml.

(26) *Asseman*, loc. cit., tom. i., p. 531; tom. ii., p. 457; tom. iii., part i, p. 622.

(27) *Peter Strozza*, Præfatio ad librum de Chaldæorum dogmatibus.

(28) See *Le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. ii., p. 1078.

ship before that of their fathers.(29) But when Cochin was conquered by the Dutch in 1663, and the Portuguese were expelled from those regions,(30) their former liberty of worshipping God in the manner of their ancestors, was restored to that oppressed people; and they continue to enjoy it to the present time. At the same time, the Dutch give no trouble to those among them who choose to continue in the Romish religion, provided they will treat kindly and peacefully those who differ from them.

PART II.

THE HISTORY OF THE MODERN CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

§ 1. Adverse Events in the Lutheran Church. Hesse became Reformed.—§ 2. Brandenburg Reformed.—§ 3. Attempted Union between the Lutherans and Reformed.—§ 4. Decree of Charenton. Conference at Leipsic.—§ 5. Conferences at Thorn and Cassel.—§ 6. Pacific Acts of John Duræus.—§ 7. John Matthiæ and George Calixtus.—§ 8. External Advantages of the Lutherans.—§ 9. Literature every where cultivated.—§ 10. State of Philosophy. Aristotelians every where reign.—§ 11. Liberty in philosophizing gradually increases.—§ 12. Excellences and Defects of the Teachers.—§ 13. The Faults of the Times often, rather than of the Persons.—§ 14. Ecclesiastical Government: Divine Right.—§ 15. The more distinguished Lutheran Writers.—§ 16, 17. History of the Lutheran Religion.—§ 18. Dogmatic Theology.—§ 19, 20. Commotions in the Lutheran Church.—§ 21. Commencement of the Calixtine Controversies.—§ 22. Continuation and Issue.—§ 23. The Doctrines of Calixtus.—§ 24. Contests with the Divines of Rinteln and Konigsberg.—§ 25. With those of Jena.—§ 26. Origin of the Pietists.—§ 27. Commotions at Leipsic.—§ 28. Their Progress.—§ 29. Rise of the Controversies with Spener and the Divines of Halle.—§ 30, 31. Their Increase.—§ 32. Some sought to advance Piety at the expense of Truth: Godfrey Arnold.—§ 33. John Conrad Dippel.—§ 34. Fictions of Jo. Will. Petersen.—§ 35. Jo. Casp. Schade, and Jo. Geo. Bœsius.—§ 36. Contests on the Omnipresence of Christ's Body, between the Divines of Tubingen and Giessen.—§ 37. Herman Rathman.—§ 38. Private Controversies.—§ 39. Those of Prætorius and Arndt.—§ 40. Jac. Bœhman.—§ 41. Prophets of this Age.—§ 42. Ezek. Meth, Esaias Stiefel, and Paul Nagel.—§ 43. Christ. Hoburg, Fred. Breckling, and Seidenbecher.—§ 44. Martin Seidelius.

§ 1. The evils and calamities which the Roman pontiffs or the Austrians, (often too obsequious to the pleasure of the pontiffs in things pertaining to religion), either brought or endeavoured to bring upon the Lutherans, in various ways during this century, have been already mentioned, in the history of the Romish church. We shall therefore now mention only some other things, by which the Lutheran church lost something of its splendour and amplitude. *Maurice* landgrave of Hesse, of the Cassel

(29) Of these, *Matur. Veisse la Croze* treats largely, Histoire du Christianisme des Indes livr. v., p. 344, &c.

(30) *Gautier Schouten*, Voyage aux Indes Orientales, tom. i., p. 319, &c., p. 466, &c.

family, a very learned prince, seceded from the Lutheran church: and he not only himself went over to the Reformed, but also in the year 1604 and onward, both at the university of Marpurg and throughout his province, displaced the Lutheran teachers who firmly resisted his purpose, and commanded the people to be thoroughly taught the Reformed doctrines, and public worship to be conducted in the Genevan manner. This design was prosecuted with the greatest firmness in the year 1619, when he ordered select theologians to proceed to the Dutch council of Dort; and commanded the decrees there made to be publicly assented to by his church. The Reformed maintained formerly, that nothing was done in this affair, which was inconsistent with equity and the highest moderation. But perhaps all impartial men in our day, will admit without difficulty, that many things would have been ordered somewhat differently, if that excellent prince had been less disposed to gratify his own will and pleasure, and more attentive to those precepts which the wisest of the Reformed themselves inculcate, respecting duty towards those who differ from us in matters of religion.(1)

§ 2. Not long after, in the year 1614, *John Sigismund* also, the elector of Brandenburg, left the communion of the Lutherans and went over to the Reformed: yet with different views from those of *Maurice*, and with different results. For he did not embrace all the doctrines, by which the followers of *Calvin* are distinguished from the Lutherans; but, in addition

(1) See *Helv. Garth's* Historischer Bericht von dem Religionswesen im Fürstenthum Hessen, 1606, 4to. *Ern. Solom. Cyprian's* Unterricht von kirchlicher Vereinigung der Protestanten, p. 263, and in the Appendix of Documents, p. 103, and the public Acts, which were published in the Unschuldigen Nachrichten, A.D. 1749. p. 25, &c. Here should be consulted especially, the writings that passed between the divines of Cassel and Darmstadt, which have a public character. Cassel, 1632, fol.; Marpurg, 1636, fol.; Giess., 1647, fol., of which, *Chr. Aug. Salig* treats, in his Historie der Augsburg. Confession, vol. i., book iv., ch. ii., p. 756, &c. [Even from the time of the Reformation onward, there were individuals in Hesse, who were inclined towards the doctrines of the Reformed; but the outward tranquillity was not thereby destroyed. *Philip* the Magnanimous, and his successors, some of whom were not obscurely favourable to the Reformed opinions, used all care to preserve this harmony. When the Formula of Concord produced so much disturbance in Saxony and Upper Germany, and threatened to destroy the peace which Hesse had hitherto enjoyed, the Hessian princes published an edict in 1572, by which they endeavoured to preserve the union. Also in the general Synods of Treysa in 1577, of Marpurg in 1578, and of Cassel in 1579, the Hessian clergy were required to subscribe certain articles, designed to preserve the union. But under the landgrave *Maurice*, the state of things changed. He had been drawn over to the side of the Reformed, by some French Reformed noblemen's sons, whom his father had procured through *Beza* to be his son's associates; and after the death of his father's brother, the landgrave *Lewis* at Marpurg in 1604, he endeavoured to introduce the Reformed religion by means of a Catechism: and in the year 1605, he dismissed all the teachers at Marpurg, and in half the upper principality of Hesse, (which had fallen to the house of Cassel), because they would not subscribe the result of the Synod without some limitation; and he established Reformed teachers in their place. The dismissed teachers, among whom the famous *Balthazar Menzer* was the most distinguished, were afterwards received by *Lewis* the landgrave of Darmstadt; and a part of them were established in the newly-erected university of Giessen, and the rest were beneficed elsewhere. As is generally the case when human passions become enlisted in religious contests, there were faults on both sides, which no impartial man at the present day, will approve. The Lutherans adhered too strenuously and too wilfully, to certain subtle doctrines of the schools, and to external rites which are not of the essence of Christianity: and the Reformed, who had the court on their side, misused the power which was in their hands, to the injury of the ancient rights of a community, whose brethren they pretended to be.—*Schl.*]

to the Genevan form of worship, he considered only the Reformed doctrines respecting the person of Christ and the presence of his body and blood in the eucharist, as more correct and tenable than the Lutheran views: but what they inculcate respecting the nature and order of divine grace, and the decrees of God, he did not adopt. And hence, he would neither send deputies to the synod of Dort, nor have their decrees respecting these difficult points to be received. The same sentiments were so far retained by the sovereign princes of Brandenburg who reigned after him, that they never required *Calvin's* doctrine of absolute decrees to be taught in the Reformed churches of their dominions, as the public and received doctrine. It is also justly accounted an honour to *John Sigismund*, that he gave his subjects full liberty either to follow the example of their prince, or to deviate from it; nor did he exclude from posts of honour and power, those who deemed it wrong to abandon the religion of their fathers. Yet this moderation was not satisfactory to the violent temper of that age, which was in many respects too rigid; for not a few thought it intolerable and provoking, that the prince should ordain that the professors of both religions should enjoy equal rank and rights; that odious terms and comparisons should be abstained from in disputation; that religious controversies should be either wholly omitted, or explained very modestly, in public discourses to the people; and lastly, that those who disagreed, should live together as friends and should interchange kind offices. And from these views originated not only bitter contests, but also at times rash and seditious commotions in the state; in allaying which many years were consumed in vain. The neighbouring divines of Saxony, and particularly those of Wittemberg, undertook to defend the side of the Lutherans in these tumults; and undoubtedly with sincere and upright intentions, but according to the customs of the times, in a style too coarse and not sufficiently temperate. And hence, not only was the Formula of Concord excluded from a place among the books by which the public religion of the Lutherans is regulated in the Brandenburg territories, but likewise the citizens of Brandenburg were forbidden to study theology in the university of Wittemberg.(2)

§ 3. So many evils resulting from the discords of those who with equal sincerity and fortitude had renounced papal servitude, that is, of the Lutherans and Reformed, might suggest to some of the principal men and to the most famous theologians of both parties, to look about them anxiously,

(2) The laws and edicts both of *John Sigismund* and his successors, in relation to this famous affair, have been sometimes printed together. There is likewise extant, a great number of books and pamphlets, from which a knowledge of these proceedings may be derived; and of which, I would rather refer to others for a full catalogue, than give an imperfect one myself. Such a catalogue is extant in the Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1745, p. 34, &c., and A D. 1746, p. 326. See also, *Jo. Charles Köcher*, Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolica, p. 312, &c. Those who wish to understand and form an estimate of the whole transaction, may consult *Godf. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, part ii., book xvii., ch. vii., p. 965. *Ern. Solom. Cyprian's* Unterricht von der Vereinigung der Protestanten, p. 75, and the Appendix of Documents, p. 225. The Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1727, p. 1069, and A.D. 1732, p. 715. Those who would persuade us, that the hope of extending his power and influence, was not the least motive with the prince for this change, conjecture, rather than demonstrate and prove; for they do not support their opinion with valid arguments. Yet it must be confessed, by such as carefully inspect the history of those times, that they do not conjecture altogether irrationally and without plausibility

for some means of uniting in bonds of mutual affection the communities rent asunder and severed by their religious sentiments. No wise man could be so ignorant of human nature, as to expect, that all difference of opinion between them could be removed, or that either party would go over to the sentiments of the other. And therefore those who undertook this business agreed, that their only aim should be to persuade the disputants that there was little or nothing of any importance to true religion and piety, in all the points controverted between the parties; that the fundamental truths on which the plan of salvation rests, are safe on both sides, and that their controversies related partly to things recondite and inexplicable, and partly to things indifferent and far removed from the supreme object of a Christian. Those who could admit these things to be true, must also admit, that the existing difference of sentiment was no just impediment to fraternal intercourse between the dissentients. And in fact, most of the Reformed were readily brought to concede, that the Lutherans erred but moderately and lightly, or did not greatly corrupt any one of the primary doctrines of Christianity: but most of the Lutherans perseveringly maintained, that they had the most weighty reasons for not judging in the same manner of the Reformed, and that a great part of the dispute related to the groundwork of all religion and piety. It is not strange, that the opposite party should brand this perseverance of the Lutherans with the odious names of moroseness, superciliousness, arrogance, and the like. But those who were taxed with these faults, brought as many charges against their accusers. For they complained, that they were not treated ingenuously; that the real character of the Reformed principles was disguised under ambiguous phraseology; and that their adversaries, though cautious and guarded, yet gave much proof that the chief ground of their great inclination for peace, was not so much a desire of the public good, as of their private advantage.

§ 4. Among the public transactions relative to this business of a union, we may justly give the first place to the project of *James* I. the king of Great Britain; who in the year 1615, attempted a reconciliation of the Lutherans and Reformed, through the instrumentality of *Peter du Moulin*, a very celebrated divine among the French Reformed.(3) The next place is due to the celebrated decree of the Reformed church of France, passed in the synod of Charenton, A.D. 1631; by which the Lutheran religion was declared harmless, holy, and free from all gross errors; and a way was opened for all the professors of it to hold sacred and civil communion with the Reformed.(4) Whatever may have been the motives for

(3) See *Mich. le Vassor's* Histoire de Louis XIII., tome ii., pt. ii., p. 21, &c. [and *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Reform., vol. v., p. 198.—*Tr.*]

(4) *Elias Benoit's* Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes, tome ii., p. 524. *Jac. Aymon's* Actes des Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées de France, tome ii., p. 500, &c. *Thomas Ittig's* Diss. de Synodi Carentoniensis indulgentia erga Lutheranos, Lips., 1705, 4to. [*Quick's* Synodicon in Gallia Reformata, vol. ii., p. 297. The words of the decree were these: "The province of Burgundy demanding, whether the faithful of the *Augustane* (*Augsburg*) Confession might be permitted to contract marriages in our churches, and to present children in our churches unto baptism, without a precedaneous abjuration of those opinions held by them, contrary to the belief of our churches? This Synod declareth, that inasmuch as the churches of the Confession of Augsburg do agree with the other reformed churches, in the principal and fundamental points of the true religion, and that there is neither superstition nor idolatry in their worship, the faithful of the said Confession, who with a spirit of love and peaceableness do join themselves

this decree, its consequences were unimportant, because few of the Lutherans were disposed to use the liberty thus generously offered them. In the same year, certain Saxon theologians, *Matthias Hoe*, *Polycarp Lyser*, and *Henry Höpfner*, were ordered to hold a conference at Leipsic with certain Hessian and Brandenburg doctors of the first class; in order that the sentiments of both parties being properly explained and compared, it might be better understood what and how great difficulties were in the way of the much-desired union. This deliberation was conducted without any intemperate heat, or lust for disputation and controversy; but at the same time, not with that mutual confidence and freedom from jealousy, which would secure harmony in the result. For though the speakers on the side of the Reformed, explained in the best manner the views of their church, and cheerfully conceded not a few things which the Lutherans hardly expected; yet the suspicions of the latter lest they should be entrapped, so intimidated them that they would not acknowledge themselves satisfied. Hence the disputants separated without accomplishing any thing.(5) Whoever wishes to learn the motives for these deliberations for peace, must inspect and examine the civil history of those times.

§ 5. The conference at Thorn in 1645, appointed by *Uladislaus* IV. king of Poland, for the purpose of uniting if possible, not only the Reformed with the Lutherans, but both also with the papists, was likewise unsuccessful. For those who were called together to make efforts if not to terminate, yet at least to diminish the existing enmities, separated more enraged than when they came together. With more success, by order of *William* VI. the landgrave of Hesse, *Peter Musæus* and *John Henichius* of the university of Rinteln, and *Sebastian Curtius* and *John Heinius* doctors of Marpurg, the two former Lutherans and the latter Reformed, when directed by the landgrave to enter into a friendly discussion, compared their sentiments at Cassel, in the year 1661. For having investigated the importance of the controversies which separated the two communities, they mutually shook hands, affirmed that it was far less than was commonly supposed, and ought not to prevent fraternal affection and harmony. But the divines of Rinteln were so utterly unable to persuade their Lutheran brethren to believe as they did, that on the contrary, their only reward was almost universal hatred, and they were assailed with bitterness in numerous publications.(6) How much labour and effort the Brandenburg

to the communion of our churches in this kingdom, may be, without any abjuration at all made by them, admitted unto the Lord's table with us; and as sureties may present children unto baptism, they promising the Consistory, that they will never solicit them either directly or indirectly, to transgress the doctrine believed and professed in our churches, but will be content to instruct and educate them in those points and articles which are in common between us and them, and wherein both the Lutherans and we are unanimously agreed."—*Tr.*]

(5) See *Timann Gesselius*, Historia sacra et ecclesiastica, pt. ii., the Addenda, p. 597–613; where the Acts themselves are given. *Jo. Wolfg. Jaeger's* Historia, sæculi xvii., Decenn. iv., p. 497, &c. [The Reformed divines were, *John Bergius*, court preacher at Berlin, *John Crocius*, professor at Marpurg, and *Theophilus Neuberger*, superintendent at Cassel. They discussed all the articles of the Augsburg Confession, to which the Reformed were ready to subscribe, and also set forth a formula of union, or rather an exposition of the articles in controversy, which was not expected from them.—*Schl.*]

(6) The writers who treat of the conferences at Thorn and Cassel, are enumerated by *Caspar Sagittarius*, Introduct. ad Historiam ecclesiast., tom. ii., p. 1604. Add *Jo. Wolfg. Jaeger's* Historia, sæculi xvii., Decenn. v., p. 689, where the Acts of the conference of Thorn,—and Decenn. vii., p. 160, where those of the conference at Cassel, are extant. *Jo. Alphonso Turretine*, Nubes

heroes, *Frederic William* and his son *Frederic*, afterwards expended in reconciling the differences of Protestants in general, and particularly in Prussia(7) and their other provinces, and what difficulties opposed and withstood those efforts, is too well known to need a long rehearsal.

§ 6. Of those, who as private individuals, assumed the office of arbiters of the contests among the Protestants, a vast number might be mentioned; but many more assumed this character among the Reformed, than among the Lutherans. The most noted among the Reformed, as all agree, was *John Duræus* [or *Dury*], a Scotchman, who was certainly an honest man, and both pious and learned, but more distinguished for genius and memory than for the power of nice discrimination and sound judgment, as might be evinced by satisfactory proofs if this were the proper place. For more than forty years, or from 1631 to 1674, he laboured with incredible fortitude and patience, by writing, persuading, admonishing, in short, in every way that could be thought of, to attain the happiness of putting an end to the contests among the Protestants. Nor did he, like others, attempt this vast enterprise, shut up in his study; but he travelled himself into nearly all the countries of Europe in which a purer religion flourished, and personally addressed and conferred with all the theologians of both parties, who were of much note and influence, and made great exertions to engage in his enterprise, kings, princes, and magistrates, and their friends, by displaying the importance and utility of his object. Most persons commended his designs, and treated him with kindness: yet very few were found willing to help forward his plans, by their personal efforts and counsels. Some persons, suspecting that so great eagerness as *Dury* manifested, must proceed from sinister designs, and that he was secretly labouring to draw the Lutherans into a snare, assailed him in writings full of acrimony; nor did all of them abstain from personal invectives and abuse. At last, neglected by his own party and repelled and rejected by ours, and discouraged by a thousand hardships, insults, and troubles, he learned that this task exceeded the power of individual efforts; and he consumed the remainder of his life in obscurity and neglect, at Cassel.(8) This honest man, though

Testium pro moderato in rebus theologicis judicio, p. 178. *Jo. Möller*, in his Life of Musæus, in Cimbria Litterata, tom. ii., p. 566, &c., treats professedly of the conference at Cassel; and in p. 568, gives an accurate catalogue of all the writings published both by the friends and the enemies of that conference.

(7) *Christ. Hartknoch's* Preussische Kirchenhistoric, p. 599. Unschuldige Nachrichten, A D. 1731, p. 1010, &c.

(8) See *Jo. Christopher Coler's* Historia Joh Duræi, Wittemb., 1716, 4to; to which however, very much might be added from documents both printed and manuscript. Some documents of this kind were published by *Theodore Hasæus*, in the Bibliotheca Bremens. Theologico-Philologica, tom. i., p. 911, &c., and tom. iv., p. 683. A great number are given by *Timann Gesselius*, in the Addenda Irenica, in his Historia Eccles., tom. ii., p. 614. His transactions with the Marpurgers, are in *Tilemann von Schenck's* Vitæ Professorum Theol. Marpurgensium, p. 202, &c. What he attempted in Holstein, may be learned from the Epistles which *Adam Henry Lackmann* has published along with the Epistles of *Luke Lossius*, p. 245. How he conducted in Prussia and Poland, we are informed by *Dan. Ern. Jablonsky*, Historia consensus Sendomiriensis, p. 127. His proceedings in Denmark, are stated by *Jac. Herm. von Elswich*, fasciculus i. epistolar. familiarium theologicar., p. 147. His acts in the Palatinate, are in *Jo. Henry von Seelen's* Deliciæ Epistolicæ, p. 353. His proceedings in Switzerland are illustrated by the Acts and Epistles published in the Museum Helveticum, tom. iii., iv., v., p. 602, &c. Many things on this subject, are also brought forward by *Jo. Wolfg. Jäger*, Historia, sæculi xvii., Decenn. vii., p. 172, and elsewhere. In general, respecting *Duræus* the reader may consult *Anth. Wilh. Böhm's*

sometimes not sufficiently explicit and ingenuous, laid for the foundation of his scheme certain principles according to which, if they should be approved, not only Lutherans and the Reformed but Christians of all sects whatever, might easily become associated. For first, he contended, that what is called the *Apostles' Creed* embraced all the doctrines necessary to be believed, and the ten commandments all the laws of conduct to be observed, and the Lord's prayer all the promises of God: and if this were true, then all Christians might unite in one family. In the next place, as appears from adequate proof, he endeavoured to attain his object by means of mystical or Quakerish sentiments. For he placed all religion in the elevation of the soul to God, or in eliciting that internal divine spark or word, that dwells in the human mind: from which it would follow, that difference of opinion on divine subjects has no connexion with religion.

§ 7. The principal Lutherans who engaged in this business, were *John Matthiæ* a Swede, bishop of Stregnas, and formerly preceptor to queen *Christina*, whom *Dury* had warmed with zeal for a coalition; and *George Calixtus*, a divine of Helmstadt, who had few equals in that age, either in learning, genius, or probity: but neither of these met with the success he desired. The *Olive Branches* of the former (for such was the title of his pamphlets on the subject) were publicly condemned; and by a royal edict were excluded from the territories of Sweden. And he himself at last, in order to appease in some measure his enemies, had to relinquish his office and retire to a private life.(9) *Calixtus*, while he dissuaded others from contention, drew on himself an immense load of accusations and conflicts; and while he endeavoured to free the church from all sects, was thought by great numbers of his brethren to be the father and author of a new sect, that of the Syncretists; that is, the sect which pursued peace and union, at the expense of divine truth.(10) We shall find hereafter, a more convenient place for speaking of the fortunes and the opinions of this great man; for he was charged with many other offences besides that of being zealous for peace with the Reformed, and the attacks made upon him threw the whole Lutheran community into commotion.

§ 8. To say something of the external prosperity of the Lutheran church, the most important circumstance is, that this church, though beset with the numberless machinations and oppressions of its enemies, could no where be entirely extirpated and obliterated. There are to this day,—and it may justly excite our wonder, very many Lutherans, even in those countries in which Lutheran worship is prohibited: nay, (as appears from the

Englische Reformationshistorie, p. 944, and the Dissertation derived very much from unpublished documents, which *Charles Jesper Benzel* exhibited at Helmstadt, under my auspices, in 1744, entitled: de Joh. Duræo, maxime de Actis ejus Suecanis. [See also *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire, art. Dureus; *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. ii., book xvii., ch. xi., § 23, &c., p. 152, &c., and *Brook's* Lives of the Puritans, vol. iii., p. 369, &c.—*Tr.*]

(9) See *Jo. Scheffer's* Suecia Litterata, p. 123, and *Jo. Moller's* Hypomnemata, upon it, p. 387. *Archenholz*, Mémoires de la Reine Christine, tome i., p. 320, p. 505, &c.; tome ii., p. 63. [*Matthiæ* published two works which gave offence to the Swedes, namely, Idea boni ordinis in ecclesia Christi; and, Ramus Olivæ septentrionalis. The last was published in ten parts, Strengnas, 1661, 1662, 12mo, and in the latter year, it was placed in the list of forbidden books.—*Tr.*]

(10) The views of this excellent man, which many have stated incorrectly, may be learned from his tract often printed, entitled: Judicium de controversiis theologicis inter Lutheranos et Reformatos, et de mutua partium fraternitate et tolerantia.

recent emigration of the Saltsburgers,(11) which deserves to be told to all future ages), in those countries in which even a silent and most cautious dissent from the established religion is a capital crime, there lie concealed vast numbers, who regard all superstition with abhorrence, and who observe in the best manner they can the great precepts of purified religion. The countries which are inhabited by persons of different religions, yet are under the spiritual dominion of the Roman pontiff, afford us numerous examples of cruelty, inhumanity, and injustice, which the Romanists think perfectly justifiable against those who dissent from them, and whom they regard as seditious citizens: yet no where could either violence or fraud wrest from the Lutherans all their rights and liberties. It may be added, that the Lutheran religion was transplanted by merchants and other emigrants, to America, Asia, and Africa; and was introduced into various places of Europe, where it was before unknown.

§ 9. The internal condition of the Lutheran church in this century, presents indeed many things to be commended, but not a few things also that deformed it. First, it was most honourable to the Lutherans, that they cultivated every where, with diligence, not only sacred learning, but also every branch of human knowledge; and that they enlarged and illustrated both literature and theology, with many and important accessions. This is so generally known, that we need not go into a prolix enumeration of the revolutions and improvements of the several sciences. From most of them, religion derived some benefit; but some of them were abused by injudicious or ill-designing men,—such is the common lot of all human affairs,—to corrupt and to explain away, that religion which the Bible reveals. In the first part of the century, those branches of learning in which intellect is chiefly concerned, were the most taught in the schools; and in a method not very alluring and pleasant: but in the latter part of it, more attention was paid to the branches which depend on genius and memory, and which afford more entertainment and pleasure, such as history, civil as well as literary and natural, antiquities, criticism, eloquence, and the like. Moreover both kinds of learning were treated in a more convenient, neat, and elegant manner. Yet it was unhappily the fact, that while human knowledge was advanced and polished, the estimation in which learning and learned men were held, was gradually lessened; which, among other causes that it will not be best to mention, may be ascribed to the multitude of those who applied themselves to study, without possessing native talents and a taste for learning.

§ 10. During the greatest part of the century no other rule of philosophizing flourished in the schools, except the Aristotelico-Scholastic: and for a long time, those who thought *Aristotle* should either be given up or amended, were considered as threatening as much danger to the church, as if they had undertaken to falsify some portion of the Bible. In this zeal for the Peripatetic philosophy, the doctors of Leipsic, Tubingen, Helmstadt, and Altdorf, went beyond almost all others. Many indeed envied the Aristotelians their high prosperity. In the first place, there were certain wise and honest men among the theologians, who admitted that it was proper to philosophize, though sparingly, but who complained, that the

(11) [There was an emigration of over one thousand Saltsburgers, in the years 1684, 1685, 1686: but the great emigration was in the years 1731 and onward, amounting to between 30,000 and 40,000 persons.—*Tr.*]

name of philosophy was attached to words and distinctions void of all meaning.(12) Next came the disciples of *Peter Ramus;* who with great diligence inculcated the precepts of their master, (which were of greater practical utility), in many both of the higher and inferior schools, to the exclusion of the Aristotelians.(13) Lastly, there were those who either condemned all philosophy, as being injurious to religion and to the community, (which *Daniel Hoffmann* did, no less unskilfully than contentiously, at Helmstadt), or who, with *Robert Fludd*, *Jacob Böhmen*, and the Rosecrucians, already mentioned,(14) boasted of having discovered by means of fire and divine illumination, an admirable and celestial mode of philosophizing. But if there had been as much harmony among these sects, as there was dissension and disagreement, they had far less power than was necessary to overthrow the empire of *Aristotle*, now confirmed by time and strong in the multitude of its defenders.

§ 11. But more danger impended over *Aristotle*, from *Des Cartes* and *Gassendi;* whose lucid and well-arranged treatises as early as the middle of the century, better pleased many of our theologians, than the many huge volumes of the Peripatetics, in which the stale and insipid wisdom of the schools was exhibited without taste or elegance. These new teachers of philosophy, the Aristotelians first endeavoured to repel by arguments of an invidious nature, by copiously displaying the great danger which this new mode of philosophizing portended to religion and to true piety; but afterwards, when they saw these weapons unsuccessful, they drew back and defended only the citadel of their cause, abandoning the outworks. For some of them coupled elegance of diction and polite literature with their precepts; nor did they deny, that though *Aristotle* was the prince of philosophers, there were some blemishes and faults in him, which a wise man might lawfully amend. But this very prudence made their adversaries more bold and daring: for they now contended, that they had obliged them to confess guilt; and therefore they opened all their batteries upon the whole school of the Stagyrite, which the others had conceded to need amendment only in part. After *Hugo Grotius*, who was but a timid opposer of the Stagyrite, *Samuel Puffendorf* first pointed out, freely and openly, a new and very different course from the Peripatetic on the law of nature and the science of morals. He was followed with still greater zeal, (notwithstanding he was nearly overwhelmed by the multitude of his enemies), by *Christian Thomasius*, a jurist first of Leipsic and then at Halle; who was not indeed a man to whose protection the interests of philosophy might be intrusted with entire confidence, yet he possessed a fearless mind and very superior genius. He attempted a reformation not of a single science only, but of every branch of philosophy; and both by words and by example, continually urged his fellow-citizens to burst asunder the bonds of *Aristotle;* whom however he did not understand, nor had he even read him. The particular mode of philosophizing, which he substituted in place of that which had prevailed, was not very favourably received, and

(12) Such was *Wenzel Schilling*, with his associates; (concerning whom, see *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. ii., book xvii., ch. vi., p. 499), and likewise others of our best theologians.

(13) See *Jo. Herm. von Elswich*, de varia Aristotelis in Protestant. scholis fortuna, § xxi., p. 54, &c., and *Jo. Geo. Walch's* Historia Logices, lib. ii., cap. i., sect. iii., § 5, in his Parerga Academica, p. 613, &c.

(14) See above, in the general history of the church, § 30, &c., p. 274, &c.

soon fell into neglect: but the spirit of innovation which he diffused, made so great progress in a short time, that he may be justly accounted the subduer of philosophic tyranny, or of *sectarian philosophy*, especially among the Germans.(15) The Frederician university at Halle in Saxony, where he taught, was the first to fall in with his views: afterwards the other schools in Germany adopted them, one after another: and from these, the same liberty of thinking extended to the other nations that followed the Lutheran religion. Towards the end of the century therefore, all among us became possessed, not by any law, but in the course of events and as it were accidentally, of the liberty of philosophizing, each according to his own judgment, and not another man's; and of exhibiting in public those principles of philosophy, which each one thought to be true and certain. This liberty was so used by the major part, that in the manner of the ancient *Eclectics*, they selected and combined the better and more probable dogmas of the various schools: yet there were some, (among whom *Godfrey William Leibnitz* was undoubtedly the greatest man), who endeavoured to search for the truth by their own efforts, and to elicit from fixed and immoveable principles a new and imperishable philosophy.(16) In this conflict with *Aristotle* and his friends, so great was the odium against the routed foe among the Lutherans, that the science of *metaphysics*, which the Stagyrite regarded as the primary science and the source of all the rest, was degraded and nearly stripped of all its honours; nor could the otherwise great influence of *Des Cartes*, who like *Aristotle* commenced all his philosophy with it, afford to it any great protection. But after the first commotions had a little subsided, principally at the recommendation of *Leibnitz*, it was not only recalled from exile, but was again honoured with the splendid title and rank of the queen of sciences.

§ 12. Many persons, who have formed such an idea of the Christian church as no wise man will ever expect to see realized, are wonderfully copious in enumerating and exaggerating the defects of the Lutheran clergy of this age. In the higher class of them, they mention arrogance, a contentious spirit, disregard of Christian simplicity, lust of domination, a carping disposition, intolerable bigotry, extreme hatred of pious and good men who may honestly deviate at all from the established rule of faith; and I know not what other things, no better than these. In the lower class of ministers, they mention ignorance, an inept mode of teaching, and neglect of their most sacred duties: and in both classes, avarice, the want of piety, indolence, and habits unbecoming the character of ministers of

(15) [Concerning *Christian Thomasius*, see *Brucker's* Historia crit. philosophiæ, tom. v., and his Append. Hist. crit. philos., p. 859, &c. Yet *Mosheim* judged more correctly of this memorable man, than *Brucker* did, who unjustly accounted him a reformer of philosophy. *Thomasius* was not properly a reformer of philosophy, though he was the *occasion* of a reform in it; for he improved the philosophical genius of the Germans, just as *Hollberg* did that of the Danes, without being himself a great discoverer in philosophy. *Thomasius* introduced more freedom of thinking. And this freedom, under his guidance, spread itself not only over philosophy, but likewise over ecclesiastical law. He often went too far in this matter, and his views were not always the best. The abuse he received from the divines of Leipsic, inflamed him with hatred against the whole clerical order. At the same time, he must have the credit of abolishing the punishment of heretics, trials for witchcraft, and certain false principles respecting marriage and divorce, &c. See Prof. *Schroeckh's* Algem. Biographie, vol. v., p. 266, &c.—*Schl.*]

(16) No one will better illustrate these facts, than *Jac. Brucker*, the man best informed on all these subjects, in his Historia critica Philosophiæ.

Christ. One who has leisure and the means of examining the morals and the state of those times, will readily grant, that there was not a small number of persons presiding over the Lutheran churches, who lacked either the ability or the disposition to point out the way of truth and salvation, wisely and well. But those who are acquainted with the history of our world, know that this has been a common evil in all ages. And on the other hand, no one will deny,—unless he is ignorant and ill-informed, or is affected by some disease of the mind,—that there were very many learned, grave, wise, and holy men, intermingled among these bad clergymen. And perhaps, if one should raise this question, Whether in the times of our fathers, or in our own times, (in which, as many think, the ancient sanctity of the clergy is revived in most places), there were the most preachers in our churches, unworthy of the office; a difficult controversy would come up, in which a person of any genius might easily find arguments on both sides. Besides, many of the faults so invidiously charged upon the clergy of this age, if the subject be duly examined, will be found to be not so much the faults of the men, as of the *times;* arising from the public calamities, the thirty years' war, (that fruitful source of innumerable evils to Germany), from a bad education also, and sometimes from the conduct of the supreme magistrates.

§ 13. This last remark will be better understood, if we notice some particulars. We do not deny what many allege, that during a great part of the century, the people were not well instructed and taught either from the pulpit or in the schools; nor shall we much resist those who maintain, that the sacred eloquence of many places was the art of declaiming boisterously, by the hour, on subjects little understood or comprehended. For though the doctrines and precepts of religion were generally brought forward, yet by most preachers they were dressed out in puerile ornaments, very foreign from the spirit of divine wisdom; and thus were in a measure deprived of their native force and beauty. Yet who can greatly wonder, that those men should have amplified their discourses with adventitious matter, who had but very few examples of good speaking before them, and who brought to the sacred office heads full of philosophical terms and distinctions and quibbles, but empty of those things which are of most use for moving the souls of men? We acknowledge, that in the universities more time was spent in the study of polemic theology, and in stating and clearing the doctrines of theology with subtilty and art, than in explaining the holy scriptures, in unfolding the principles of morals, in imbuing the mind with pious emotions, and in other things necessary in a minister of religion. Yet this fault I think, will be censured with less severity, by one who has learned from the history of those times, with what zeal and subtilty numerous adversaries attacked the Lutheran cause, and to what dangers it was exposed from those adversaries, especially from the papists. When war rages on every side, the art of war and of defending one's country, it is well known, is commonly regarded as the most valuable of all arts. I wish they had shown more mildness, towards great numbers who from excessive curiosity or from ignorance or the ardour of their imaginations, fell into errors, yet did not disturb the public peace with their opinions. But from education, and from their earliest impressions, (which are well known to have boundless influence), our ancestors derived the sentiment, that corrupters of divine truth ought to be restrained. And the more

simplicity and attachment to the divine glory they possessed, the more difficult was it for them to discard the maxim, transfused into their minds from the ecclesiastical law of the papists, that whoever is adjudged an enemy of God, should be adjudged an enemy of his country.

§ 14. In the form of church government, the mode of worship, and other external regulations of our church, little or no change was made in most places. Yet many and great changes would have been made, if the princes had deemed it for the public good to regulate ecclesiastical matters according to the prescriptions of certain great and excellent men, who near the close of the century, led on by *Christian Thomasius*, attempted a reformation of our system of ecclesiastical law. These famous jurists, in the first place, set up a new fundamental principle of church polity, namely the supreme authority and power of the civil magistrate: and then, after establishing with great care and subtilty this basis, they founded upon it a great mass of precepts, which in the judgment of many were considered, and not without reason, as tending to this point, that the sovereign of a country is also sovereign of the religion of its citizens, or is their supreme pontiff; and that the ministers of religion, are not to be accounted ambassadors of God, but vicegerents of the chief magistrates. They also weakened not a little the few remaining prerogatives and advantages of the clergy, which were left of the vast number formerly possessed; and maintained, that many of the maxims and regulations of our church, which had come down from our fathers, were relics of popish superstition. This afforded matter for long and pernicious feuds and contests between our theologians and our jurists. I leave others to inquire, with what temper and designs and with what success, these contests were managed on both sides. It will be sufficient for us to observe, what is abundantly attested, that they diminished much in one place and another, the respect for the clergy, the reverence for religion, and the security and prosperity of the Lutheran church. And hence, most unfortunately such is the state of things among us, that those of honourable birth, or who are distinguished for strength of genius, or for noble and ingenuous feelings, look upon the study of theology as beneath them, there being neither honour nor much emolument attached to it; and every day, the number of wise and erudite theologians, is becoming less. This is lamented, by those who see in what a perilous state the Lutheran cause now is: and perhaps those who come after us, will have cause to lament it still more.

§ 15. With the names of celebrated men among the Lutherans, whose writings have promoted their own reputations and the interests of the church, we might fill up several pages. It will be sufficient for the young theologian, to acquaint himself well with the merits and the labours of the following. *Ægidius*, and *Nicholas Hunnius*; *Leonard Hutter*; *John*, and *John Ernest Gerhard*; *George*, and *Frederic Ulric Calixtus*; the *Mentzers*; the *Oleariuses*; *Frederic Baldwin*; *Albrecht Grawer*; *Matthias Hoe*; the *Carpzovs*; *John*, and *Paul Tarnovius*; *John Affelmann*; *Eilh. Lubin*; the *Lysers*; both the *Michael Walthers*; *Joachim Hildebrand*; *John Val. Andreæ*; *Solomon Glassius*; *Abraham Calovius*; *Theodore Hackspan*; *John Hülsemann*; *James Weller*; the brothers, *Peter* and *John Musæus*; *John Conrad Dannhauer*; *John George Dorschæus*; *John Arnd*; *Martin Geyer*; *John Adam Schertzer*; *Balthasar*, and *John Meisner*; *Augustus Pfeiffer*; *Henry*, and *John Müller*; *Justus Christo-*

pher Schomer; Sebastian Schmid; Christian Kortholt; the *Osianders; Philip James Spener; Gebhard Theodore Meyer; Fridem. Bechmann;* and others.(17)

(17) For the lives and writings of these men, see, besides the common writers of literary history, *Henry Witte*, in his Memoriæ Theologorum, and his Diarium Biographicum; *Henry Pipping* and *George Henry Götze*, in their Memoriæ Theologorum; and others. [The following brief notices are abridged from *Schlegel* and *Von Emem.*—*Æg. Hunnius*, born 1550, prof. of theology at Marpurg 1576, and at Wittemberg 1592, where he died 1603, was a great polemic divine. His Latin Works, 5 vols. fol., were printed 1607–1609.—His son of the same name, superintendent at Altenburg, died 1642.—*Nicholas Hunnius*, prof. at Wittemberg and superintendent at Lubec, died 1643. He wrote against the Catholics; and a plan for terminating religious controversies.—*Hutter* died a prof. at Wittemberg in 1616. He was a bitter polemic against the Reformed.—*John Gerhard*, born 1582, professor at Coburg and Jena, died 1637. His Loci Communes enlarged by *Cotta*, are still in repute. His Confessio Catholica confutes the Catholic theology, by the fathers, councils and schoolmen.—His son, *Jo. Ernst Gerhard*, professor of theology at Jena, died 1668, and his grandson, of the same name, professor of theology at Giessen, died 1707.—*Geo. Calixtus*, an elegant scholar, and a learned theologian, professor at Helmstadt, died 1656. His conflicts are afterwards mentioned by Dr. Mosheim.—His son *Geo. Ulric Calixtus*, trod in the steps of his father; but possessed less talent.—*Balthazar Mentzer*, the father, professor at Marpurg and Giessen, famous as a violent polemic against the Reformed, died 1627.—*Balthazar Mentzer*, the son, was professor at Marpurg, Rinteln, and Giessen; and died 1679.—*John Olearius* (or *Œlschlager*) who died 1623, professor of Hebrew at Helmst. and superintendent at Halle, was the parent of the others.—*Jo. Godfr. Olearius*, his son, succeeded his father at Halle.—*Jo. Olearius*, the grandson of John, was professor of Greek at Leipsic, wrote de Stylo N. Test., and died 1713.—*Godfrey Olearius*, son of the last, and great-grandson of the first John, was professor of theology at Leipsic, and died 1715.—*Fred. Baldwin* was professor of theology at Wittemb.; wrote a commentary on Paul's Epistles; Cases of Conscience, &c.; and died 1627.—*Grawer*, professor at Jena, and general superintendent at Weimer, an angry polemic, and denominated the shield and sword of Lutheranism, died 1617.—*Hoe* was nobly born at Vienna; was a court preacher, and a strenuous adversary of the Reformed; and died in 1645.—*Jo. Bened. Carpzov*, professor of theology at Leipsic, wrote Isagoge in libros symbol., and died 1657.—His son *Jo. Bened. Carpzov*, also professor of theology at Leipsic, and famed for his Rabbinic learning, died 1699.—His brother, *Sam. Bened. Carpzov*, court preacher at Dresden, died 1707.—*Jo. Tarnovius*, professor of theology at Rostock, a good interpreter, died 1629.—*Paul Tarnovius*, a kinsman of the former, and a professor at Rostock, also a biblical interpreter; died in 1633.—*Affelmann* (or *von Affeln*), was an acute but angry disputant, professor of theology at Rostock, and died 1624.—*Lubin*, professor, first of poetry, and then of theology, at Rostock, was an elegant scholar, and a good interpreter of Paul's epistles; died 1621.—*Polycarp Lyser*, prof. of theology at Wittemberg, a zealous defender of Lutheranism, died 1610.—His son, *Polycarp*, professor of theology at Leipsic, also an acute polemic, died 1633.—The brother of the last, *William Lyser*, was professor of theology at Wittemb., and died in 1649.—*Walther*, the father, professor of theology at Helmst., and then general superintendent of East Friesland, died at Zelle 1662.—*Walther*, the son, was professor of mathematics, and then of theology at Wittemberg, and died 1692.—*Hildebrand*, professor of theology and ecclesiastical antiquities at Helmstadt, and then upper superintendent in Luneburg, died 1671.—*J. V. Andreæ*, the son of *John*, and grandson of the famous chancellor *James Andreæ* of Tubingen, sustained various offices, court preacher, consistorial counsellor, &c. He was a great satirical genius, as well as profoundly learned; and was supposed to be the author of the Rosecrucian comedy; died 1654, aged 68.—*Solomon Glass*, author of Philologia Sacra, was born 1593, became professor of Hebrew and Greek, and then of theology, at Jena, and lastly general superintendent at Gotha, where he died 1656. He was very learned and pious.—*Calovius*, professor at Königsberg, rector at Dantzig, and professor of theology at Wittemberg; died 1686, aged 74. He was a learned dogmatic theologian, and severe against dissentients from Lutheranism.—*Hackspan*, a learned Orientalist, professor of the Oriental languages, and then of theology, at Altorf, died 1659, aged 52.—*Hülsemann*, a scholastic divine, was professor of theology, first at Wittemberg, and then at Leipsic, where he died 1661, aged 59. He

§ 16. No violence was publicly offered to the fundamental articles of religion, as professed by the Lutheran church: nor would any one easily have found toleration among the Lutheran doctors, if he had ventured to forsake, or to invalidate, the doctrines clearly defined and explained in what are called the *Symbolical* books. But in more modern times, from various causes, the high authority once possessed by those rules of faith and doctrine, has in many places, been much weakened and diminished. And hence arises the liberty, enjoyed by those who are not professed teachers in the church, of dissenting from the symbolical books; and of expressing that dissent at pleasure, both orally and in their writings. Formerly, such as opposed any article of the public religion, or disseminated new opinions among the people, were judicially arraigned; and they could seldom escape without some loss of honour and emoluments, unless they would abjure their

strenuously opposed all union with the Reformed.—*Weller*, author of a famous Greek Grammar, was a good teacher of the Oriental languages and theology, at Wittemberg; and then court preacher at Dresden; died 1664, aged 62.—*Peter Musæus*, a learned and moderate man, professor of theology at Rinteln, Helmstadt, and Kiel, where he died 1674, aged 54.—*John Musæus*, a judicious divine, first a professor of history and poetry, and then of theology, at Jena; died 1681, aged 68. Both these brothers were liberal-minded men.—*Dannhauer*, a poet and professor of theology at Strasburg, died 1666, aged 63.—*Dorschæus* of Strasburg, a prof. of theology there, and at Rostock, where he died in 1659, aged 62; was very learned. —*Arnd*, after various changes and persecutions, died general superintendent of Zelle, in 1621, aged 66; a very pious man, though mystical. See above, p. 136, note (15).—*Geyer*, a preacher and professor at Leipsic, and court preacher at Dresden; a devout man, a commentator on some books of the Old Testament, died 1680, aged 66.—*Schertzer*, professor of theology at Leipsic, a disciple of Hülsemann, author of a system of theology; died 1683, aged 55.—*Balth. Meisner* of Dresden, professor of theology at Wittemberg, a modest and liberal-minded man; died 1626, aged 39.—*Jo. Meisner*, prof. of theology at Wittemberg; much opposed by *Calovius*, for his liberal views; died 1681, aged 66.—*Pfeiffer*, a good Orientalist and expositor, author of Dubia Vexata, and Critica Sacra, was prof. of Oriental languages and of theology, first at Wittemberg, and then at Leipsic, and superintendent at Lubec, where he died 1698, aged 58.—*Henry Müller*, a friend of *Spener*, preacher and prof. at Rostock, known by his practical writings, died 1675, aged 44.—*Jo. Müller*, a preacher at Hamburg, and bitter opposer of *Henry Müller* and *Jac. Bœhmen*, died 1672, aged 74.—*Schomer*, of Lubec, professor of theology at Rostock, died 1693, aged 45; and was a man of general knowledge.—*Schmid*, a native of Alsace, and professor at Strasburg, was learned in the Oriental languages, and distinguished as a biblical interpreter. His Latin translation of the Bible, and comment. on several books, did him much credit; he died 1696, aged 79.—*Kortholt* was professor of theology at Rostock, and then at Kiel, where he was vice-chancellor, and died 1694, aged 61. He advanced church history, and promoted piety and religious knowledge in the country around him.—*Lucas Osiander*, senior, (son of *Andrew Osiander*, senior), was court preacher, and consistorial counsellor at Stutgard, and employed in promoting the reception of the Formula of Concord. He abridged and continued the Magdeburg centuries; and died, 1604, aged 73.—*Andrew Osiander*, (son of the former), became chancellor at Tubingen, and died 1617, aged 55, leaving nine children. He published a Latin Bible with notes.—*Lucas Osiander*, junior, (son of *Lucas Osiander*, senior), professor of theology, and chancellor at Tubingen; a violent polemic and particularly hostile to *Menzer* and *Arnd*; died 1638, aged 67.—*John Adam Osiander*, (son of *Jo. Balthasar Osiander*, superintendent of Vaihingen), was court preacher at Stutgard, prof. of Greek, and then of theology, and finally chancellor, at Tubingen; a polemic divine; died 1697, aged 75.—*Phil. Jac. Spener*, of upper Alsace, preacher at Strasburg, Frankfort, and at the court of Dresden, and provost of Berlin, where he died 1705, aged 76. He was learned and eloquent, and a great promoter of piety; and will be noticed hereafter.—*Meyer*, well read in ecclesiastical antiquities, was professor of theology at Helmstadt, where he died 1693. He wrote commentar. de recondita veteris eccles. theologia: and published *Justell's* Codex canonum ecclesiæ universæ.—*Bechmann* was professor at Jena, and died in 1703.—*Tr.*]

opinions. But no one feared any thing of this kind, after the principle which the Arminians first zealously propagated, had gradually made its way among the Lutheran churches, in the latter part of the seventeenth century; namely, that every man is accountable to God only, for his religious opinions; and that it is wrong, for the state to punish any man for his erroneous faith, provided he does nothing to disturb the public tranquillity. It were to be wished, that this liberty of opinion (which every one will approve, in proportion to his equity, and his confidence in his own virtue) had not degenerated into the unbridled licentiousness, of treating every thing sacred and salutary with utter contempt, and of attacking with amazing wantonness, the honour both of religion and its ministers.

§ 17. The study of the sacred scriptures was never intermitted among the Lutherans; nor were they at any time without skilful interpreters of the Bible, and trusty guides of those interpreters. To say nothing of *Tarnovius*, *Gerhard*, *Hackspan*, *Calixtus*, *Erasmus Schmid*, and the many other famous expounders of the divine books, there was published, at the very time which some tax with the greatest neglect of this kind of studies, the immortal work of *Solomon Glassius*, entitled *Philologia Sacra;* than which, nothing can be a more useful help for understanding the language of the divine scriptures. Still it must be confessed, that during a large part of the century, most of the doctors in the universities were more occupied in explaining and defending with subtilty the dogmas and tenets of the church, than in expounding that volume whence all solid knowledge of them must be derived. Yet if in this there was any thing reprehensible, the subsequent theologians caused the interests of the Lutheran religion to derive little injury from it. For as soon as the commotions produced by the wars and controversies, particularly with the papists, had begun to subside, great numbers applied themselves to the exposition of the scriptures; to which they were excited and quickened very much, if I do not misjudge, by the industry of those Dutch theologians who followed after *Cocceius*. At the head of these later interpreters, may be placed perhaps *Sebastian Schmid;* whom no one has exceeded, at least in the number of his productions. Next to him, *Abraham Calovius*, *Martin Geyer*, *Schomer*, and some others, most deserve to be mentioned.(18) The *Pietistic* controversies, though otherwise most lamentable, were at last attended with this among other consequences, that greater numbers than before, applied themselves to the careful reading of the holy scriptures, and to meditation on their contents. The merits of these expositors, as is common, were unequal. Some investigated merely the import of the words, and the sense of the text. Others, besides this, encountered opposers; and either confuted their false expositions, or applied the true interpretation to the subversion of their erroneous opinions. Others, after exhibiting briefly the sense of an [inspired] writer, applied it to morals, and to instruction in Christian duty. Some are represented, and perhaps not unjustly, as having, by assiduously reading the books of the Cocceians, fallen into some of their faults; and as inconsiderately turning the sacred histories into allegories, by searching after recondite and remote senses, rather than the obvious sense of the words.

§ 18. The principal divines of this century, at first presented the doc-

(18) The reader may here consult *Jo. Fran. Buddeus*, Isagoge in theologiam, lib. ii., cap. viii., p. 1686, &c.

trines of religion derived from the scriptures, in a loose and disconnected form, after the manner of *Melancthon;* that is, arranged under general heads (*Locos Communes*): yet this did not prevent them from employing in the explanation and statement of particular doctrines, the terms, the distinctions, and the definitions of the then reigning and admired Peripatetic philosophy. Afterwards, *George Calixtus*, who was himself addicted to the Aristotelian philosophy, first clothed theology in a philosophic dress; that is, reduced it to the form of a science or a system of truths: but he was censured by many, not so much for doing such a thing, as because he did not give to this most sacred science a suitable form. For he divided the whole science into three parts, *the object, the subject*, and *the means*; which, though accordant with the precepts of *Aristotle*, to whom he was exclusively attached, was, in the opinion of some, an unsuitable distribution.(19) A number of the best teachers however, eagerly adopted that arrangement; and even in our times, there are some who commend it, and follow it in practice. Some arranged religious doctrines in a different manner; but they had not many imitators. Nevertheless, there were many respectable and pious men throughout the century, who were very much displeased with this mode of teaching theology philosophically, or of combining sacred truths with the dictates of philosophy: they earnestly desired, to see all human subtilties and nice speculation laid aside, and theology exhibited, just as God exhibits it in the holy scriptures; that is, in a simple, perspicuous, popular form, cleared and freed wholly from any philosophical fetters. These persons were gratified to some extent, as the century drew to a close, when *Philip James Spener*, and not a few others, animated by his exhortations and example, began to treat on religious subjects with more freedom and clearness; and when the Eclectics drove the Peripatetic philosophy from the schools. *Spener* could not, indeed, persuade *all* to follow his method; yet he persuaded a great many. Nor can there be any doubt, that from this time onward, theology acquired a more noble and agreeable aspect. Polemic theology experienced much the same fortunes, as dogmatic. For it was, for the most part, destitute of all elegance and perspicuity, so long as *Aristotle* had dominion in the theological schools: but after his banishment, it gradually received some degree of light and polish. Yet we must acknowledge, with regret, that the common faults of disputants were not effaced, even after those times. For if we turn over the pages of the earlier or the later religious controversialists of this century, we find few whom we can truly pronounce desirous of nothing but the advancement of truth, or not deceived and led away by their passions.

§ 19. Our theologians were tardy in cultivating moral theology. Nor, if we except a few eminent men, such as *John Arnd* and *John Gerhard*, and others who treated in a popular way, of the formation of the soul to the true and internal worship of God, and of the duties of men; was there

(19) [This distribution into the *object*, *subject*, and *means* in theology, may be understood, by considering what parts of theology he placed under each of these heads. Under the *first*, he considered man's supreme good, the immortality of the soul, the resurrection, the last judgment, eternal blessedness and damnation. Under the *second*, he considered the doctrines concerning God, creation, man's state of innocence and apostacy, with its consequences. Under the *third*, he considered the doctrines concerning the grace of God, the merits of Christ, his person and offices, faith and justification, the word of God, the sacraments, conversion, good works, &c.—*Tr.*]

a single excellent and accurate writer on the science of morals, in all the first part of the century. And hence, those who laboured to elucidate what are called *cases of conscience*, were held in estimation; notwithstanding they must often unavoidably fall into very frequent mistakes, as the first and fundamental principles of morals were not yet accurately laid down. *George Calixtus*, whose merits are so great in regard to all other branches of theology, first separated the science of morals from that of dogmatics, and gave it the form of an independent science. He was not indeed allowed to complete the design, which all admired in its commencement; but his disciples applied the materials they got from him, to construct not unsuccessfully, a proper system of moral theology. Scarcely any thing injured more their labours, in process of time, than the Peripatetic dress, with which *Calixtus* chose to invest also this part of divine truth. Hence the moderns have torn off this dress, and calling in the aid of the law of nature, which *Puffendorf* and others had purified and illustrated, and collating it carefully with the sacred scriptures, have not only more clearly laid open the sources of Christian duties, and more correctly ascertained the import of the divine laws, but have digested and arranged this whole science in a much better manner.

§ 20. During this whole century, the Lutheran church was greatly agitated; partly by controversies among the principal doctors, to the great injury of the whole community; and partly by the extravagant zeal and plans of certain persons, who disseminated new and strange opinions, uttered prophecies, and attempted to change all our doctrines and institutions. The controversies which drew the doctors into parties, may be fitly divided into the greater and the less; the former such as disturbed the whole church, and the latter, such as disquieted only some part of it. Of the first kind, there were two which occupied the greatest part of the century; the *Syncretistic*, which from the place whence it arose, was called the *Helmstadian* controversy, and from the man chiefly concerned in it, the *Calixtine* controversy; and the *Pietistic*, which some call the *Hallensian* controversy, from the university with which it was waged. Both were occasioned by principles, than which nothing is more holy and lovely: the former by the love of peace and Christian forbearance, so highly commended by our Saviour; and the latter, by the desire of restoring and advancing fallen piety, which every good man admits should be among the first cares of a Christian teacher. Against these two great virtues, *zeal* for maintaining the truth and for preserving it from all mixture of error, which is likewise an excellent and very useful virtue, engaged in open war. For so critical and fallacious is the condition of human nature, that from the best things as their source, contentions and pestilence may flow, if turbid emotions get control of the mind.

§ 21. *George Calixtus* of Sleswick, a theologian who had few equals in this century either for learning or genius, while teaching in that university which from its first establishment granted proper liberty of thought to its professors, early intimated, that in his view there were some defects in the common opinions of theologians. Afterwards he went farther, and showed in various ways, that he had a strong desire not so much to establish peace and harmony among disagreeing Christians, as to diminish their anger and implacable *hatred* to each other. Nor did his colleagues differ much from him in this matter; which will the less surprise those who know, that such

as are created doctors of theology in the university of Helmstadt, are accustomed all of them, to make oath that they will endeavour according to their ability, to reconcile and settle the controversies among Christians. The first avowed attack upon them was made in 1639, by *Statius Buscher*, a minister of St. Giles' church in Hanover, an indiscreet man, of the Ramist school and hostile to [the prevailing] philosophy; who was much displeased, because *Calixtus* and his associates preferred the Peripatetic philosophy before that of the sect he had embraced. He made the attack in a very malignant book, entitled: *Crypto-Papismus novæ Theologiæ Helmstadiensis*;(20) in which he accused *Calixtus* especially, of numerous errors. Though *Buscher* made some impression on the minds of individuals, he would perhaps have incurred the reproach of being a rash and unjust accuser, if he had only led *Calixtus* to be more cautious. But the latter, possessing a generous spirit that disdained all dissimulation, with his colleague *Conrad Horneius*, not only persevered in confidently asserting and defending the things which *Buscher* had brought many to regard as novelties and dangerous; but likewise, in the conference at Thorn in 1645, he incurred the indignation and enmity of the Saxon divines, who were there present. *Frederic William*, the elector of Brandenburg, had made him colleague and assistant to the divines whom he sent from Königsberg to that conference: and the Saxon deputies thought it shameful, that a Lutheran divine should afford any aid to the Reformed. This first cause of offence at the conference, was followed by others, which occasioned the Saxons to accuse *Calixtus*, of being too friendly to the Reformed. The story is too long to be fully stated here. But after the conference broke up, the Saxon divines, *John Hülsemann*, *James Weller*, *John Scharf*, *Abraham Calovius*, and others, attacked *Calixtus* in their public writings, maintaining, that he had apostatized from the Lutheran doctrines to the sentiments of the Reformed and the papists. These their attacks he repelled, with great vigour and uncommon erudition, being profoundly versed in philosophy and all antiquity; until the year 1656, when he passed from these scenes of discord to heavenly rest.(21)

(20) [I. e., the disguised Popery of the new Theology at Helmstadt.—*Tr.*]

(21) Whoever wishes to know merely the series of events in this controversy, the titles of the books published, the doctrines that were controverted, and similar things, may find writers enough to consult; such as *Walch*, Introduction to the Controversies in our church, (in German). *Andr. Charles Weismann*, [Historia Eccles., sæcul. xvii., p. 1194]. *Arnold*, [Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. ii., book xvii., ch. xi., § 1, &c.], and many others; but especially, *Jo. Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. iii., p. 121, where he treats largely of the life, fortunes, and writings of *Calixtus*. But whoever wishes to understand the internal character of this controversy, the causes of the several events, the characters of the disputants, the arguments on both sides, in short, the things that are of the highest importance in the controversy, will find no writer, to whose fidelity he can safely trust. This history requires a man of ingenuousness, of extensive knowledge of the world, well furnished with documents, which are in a great measure not yet published, and also not a novice in court policy. And I am not certain, whether even in this age, if a man could be found competent to do it, all that is important to the history of this controversy, could be published to the world without exciting odium and producing harm. [The translator, (says *Schlegel*, who was a pupil of *Mosheim*), may be allowed here to insert the judgment of *Mosheim*, which he brought forward in his Lectures; in which he communicated with his hearers, more freely, than he usually does in his writings with his readers.—*Calixtus*, by his travels, became acquainted with people of various creeds, and particularly with Romish Catholics and the Reformed; and by this intercourse, he acquired a kind of moderation in his judgments respecting persons of

§ 22. After the death of *Calixtus*, and the decease also of those by whom he had been most opposed, the flames of this war raged far worse than be-

other denominations. In particular, he had resided long in England, and contracted intimacy with several bishops. Here he imbibed the fundamental principles of the English reformation, and his partiality for the ancient churches. And hence he assumed the consent of the church in the five first centuries, as a second source of a true knowledge of the Christian faith; and was of opinion, that *we* had gone too far in the Reformation, and that we should have done better, if we had regulated the church according to the pattern of the early churches. From this source, afterwards followed all his peculiarities of sentiment. Hence his attachment to ecclesiastical antiquity: hence his desire for the union of all classes of Christians: hence his inclination towards the Romish church; which cannot be denied, though he acknowledged and exposed numerous faults and abuses in that church. And hence also it arose, that he had a particular respect for the English church, as retaining more of the usages of the ancient church: and that many of his pupils went over, some to the Romish, and others to the English church. *Calixtus* became renowned in early life. A young lord of Klenck, had been prepossessed in favour of the Catholic religion by the Jesuit, *Augustine Turrianus* of Hildesheim. The mother wishing to prevent his apostacy, invited *Cornelius Martini*, a professor at Helmstadt, and the strongest metaphysician of his age, to come to her castle at Hildesheim, and dispute with the Jesuit in the presence of her son. *Martini* denied himself this honour, and recommended to it his pupil, the young *Calixtus*. He, on the first day, drove the Jesuit into such straits, that he could say nothing; and the next morning he secretly decamped. The history of this transaction may be found in the Summa Colloquii Hemelschenburgensis. This remarkable victory led the duke of Brunswick, to raise him from a master in philosophy, to the rank of professor in theology. While only a master, he had published fifteen Disputationes de præcipuis religionis Christianæ capitibus; in which he intimated pretty clearly, that he did not believe *all* that was generally believed in our church; and particularly, he explained the doctrine of the transfer of attributes (communicatio idiomatum), differently from the common explanation. Likewise to his Epitome Theologiæ, published in 1619, *Balthazar Menzer* of Giessen and *Henry Höpfner* of Leipsic, made many exceptions. For he mixed his Scholastic philosophy with theology; and taught among other things, that God was the accidental cause of sin,—a proposition, which was liable to be very ill interpreted, and which he afterwards recalled, on account of its liability to misinterpretation. Thus he was involved in contentions from the commencement of his professorship; and they were increased in 1634, when he published the first part of his Epitome Theologiæ Moralis, and subjoined to it a Digression, de Nova Arte, in opposition to *Barthold Nihusen*. In particular, the Ramists were his mortal enemies, because he was an Aristotelian. One of these Ramists, *Statius Buscher*, (who had read lectures at Helmstadt as a master, before *Calixtus* did), being prompted to it by some enemies of *Calixtus*, published his Crypto-Papismus novæ theologiæ Helmstadiensis; to which *Calixtus* and *Horneius* made answer. The honest *Buscher* was summoned before the Consistory: but he chose not to appear personally, and therefore defended himself in writing. He gave up his office, retired to Stade, where he died of grief in 1641. Thus this contest faded away. *Buscher's* accusations were ill founded; and his patrons were afraid to expose themselves. But four years after, a very different conflict arose, which lasted as long as *Calixtus* lived. The king of Poland, *Ladislav* IV., appointed the Charitable Conference (Colloquium charitativum) at Thorn: in which all religious parties were to appear, and confer together on religion, and come to agreement. To this conference, on the side of the Lutherans, some Saxon divines of Wittemberg, especially, were invited from Germany; for they were regarded as standing at the head of all the German theologians. The great elector of Brandenburg, prince *Frederic William*, invited *Calixtus* of Brunswick to accompany and assist the Königsberg divines: and *Calixtus* not only complied, but also committed the error, of going previously to Berlin and thence travelling in company with the Reformed divines to Thorn, lodging in the same house, eating at the same table, and in general having the greatest familiarity with them. As the Königsberg divines had not yet arrived, and so *Calixtus* had nothing to do in the Conference, the magistrates of Elbing and Thorn invited him to assist *them:* which he engaged to do. But the Saxon and Dantzic divines, (among the latter of whom *Calovius* was the most violent), threw in their remonstrance; alleging, that he could not be admitted as a speaker in behalf of the divines of these cities, because he

fore. The Saxons continued, and especially *Calovius*, most bitterly to insult the dead lion: nay, proceeded to pave the way imprudently, (as many of the best men, who were by no means Calixtinians, believed), for an open schism in the Lutheran church. For a new book was drawn up, entitled, *Renewed Consent to the true Lutheran faith* (Consensus repetitus Fidei vere Lutheranæ); which was to be added to those we call *Symbolical* books, and to be consented to under oath, by all public teachers; and by which, *Calixtus* with his followers and friends, was pronounced unworthy of the Lutheran community, and therefore also of the benefits of the peace granted to the Lutherans. The memory or reputation of *Calixtus* was modestly defended, by *Gerhard Titius*, *Joachim Hildebrand*, and other theologians of a temperate character. And the most discerning men demonstrated,

belonged to a university which did not embrace the Formula of Concord, and because he had rendered himself suspected, by his intimacy with the Reformed. This remonstrance induced the senate of Elbing to desist from the measure. Though *Calixtus* could not in this way be brought to take an active part, another occurrence afforded him something to do. The Polish Reformed and the Bohemian Brethren, when they saw that the Dantzic divines would not tolerate him among the Lutheran speakers, invited him to be *their* speaker: which he consented to, yet with the restriction, that he should hold with them, only in the points on which Protestants were at issue with the Catholics. He afterwards printed some notes on the Creed, which were laid before the Conference; in which he made it appear, that he did not in all points agree with the Reformed. But all this was insufficient to quiet the suspicions against him. The rumour spread every where, that *Calixtus* was an apostate. The disaffection towards him was increased, as the Polish Roman Catholic lords of Thorn treated him with more attention than they did the other divines, and associated more frequently with him. If *Calixtus* had possessed more prudence and foresight, and his opposers more candour and justice, things would not have come to such a pass. While these events were going on, the Königsberg divines arrived. But now a contest arose between them and the divines of Dantzic, respecting precedence. The former claimed precedence, as being envoys of the great electoral prince; and the latter, because they had previously arrived, and had taken their seats. In such contests, the whole three months allotted to the Conference, passed away; and the deputies returned home, having accomplished nothing. The contest with *Calixtus* now became warm. The Saxon divines were obliged to justify their conduct towards him at the Conference; and they found it necessary to charge him with being a corrupter of religion, a concealed Calvinist and a wicked heretic. *Calixtus* himself gave occasion for increasing the strife, by a disputation on the mystery of the Trinity, which Dr. *Jo. Latermann* wrote and defended under him, in 1645; in which it was maintained, that the doctrine of the Trinity was not made known to the fathers under the Old Testament, and that it was a created angel, and not the Son of God, who appeared to the patriarchs. On this point he was assailed, although he had so explained himself as ought to have given satisfaction. Our whole church was, by this contest, wrought into a flame which it was difficult to extinguish. *Solomon Glassius*, by order of *Ernesti* duke of Gotha, published his Thoughts; which aimed to restore peace, and in many points did justice to *Calixtus*. But the effort was fruitless. Duke *Ernesti* went farther; he wrote to the electoral court of Saxony and to the court of Brunswick, and urged them to lend aid to allay these angry disputes. But the minds of men were so imbittered, that they could not think of peace. At length, as the Saxon divines, and particularly *Calovius*, (who had previously been invited to Wittemberg), urged the setting forth a new symbolical book, the princes of electoral Saxony so vividly depicted the mischiefs which would thence result to our church, that in view of these representations, the proposed introduction of what was called the Consensus Repetitus, was laid aside. Yet the conflicts went on, and were conducted with so much bitterness and acrimony, that one party commenced an action against the other for abuse; and *Calovius* wrote his bitter Historia Syncretistica, which was confiscated by the elector of Saxony. Finally, as the Pietistic contest commenced soon after this, so the *Calixtine* contest was dropped. For the Wittembergers engaged in a new controversy with Dr. *Spener*, and as they were afraid that the Calixtinians would all join with *Spener*, so they made a compromise with the divines of Helmstadt. —*Schl.*]

that the book called *Consensus*, &c., would be a firebrand, the cause of perpetual dissension, and ruinous to the Lutheran cause; and by their efforts, it was prevented from ever obtaining the least authority. It was opposed, besides others of less note, by *Frederic Ulrich Calixtus*, the son of *George*, a man not unlearned, yet much inferior to his father in genius, polish, and erudition. In favour of the Consensus, appeared and fought, especially *Abraham Calovius* and *Ægidius Strauchius*. An immense number of books and disputes were produced by the zeal of the two parties, in which, alas! are so many invectives, reproaches, and personal abuses, as to make it manifest that the disputants contended less for the cause of truth and of Christ Jesus, than for personal glory and revenge. After long-continued altercation, the enfeebled age of those who led the two parties, the abolition of the *Consensus repetitus*, (which would have afforded aliment for ruinous war), the rise of new controversies among us, with some other causes, near the end of the century, silently put an end to the contest.

§ 23. The principal of all the charges so odiously alleged against *Calixtus*, was, his zeal for bringing the three larger communities of European Christians, not to *unite* together and become *one body* as his opposers interpreted him to mean, but to abstain from their mutual hatred and *enmity*, and to cultivate mutually love and good-will. And this it was, that was generally condemned under the name of *Syncretism*.(22) The opinions

(22) I do not espouse the cause of *Calixtus*; nor maintain, that all he wrote and taught, was faultless: but the love of truth admonishes me to say, that this excellent man fell into the hands of bad interpreters; and that even those, who thought they understood his meaning better than others, erred egregiously. He is commonly represented as advising to a *union* with the Romish pontiff and his adherents; but entirely without grounds. For he declared publicly, that with the Romish church, such as it now is, we cannot possibly associate and be in harmony; and that if formerly there was any hope of healing the breach, that hope was wholly extinguished and annihilated by the denunciations of the council of Trent. He is said also, to have approved or excused, all the errors and superstitions which deform the Romish church, or at least very many of them. But here, not only the numerous writings, in which he refutes the doctrines and opinions of the papists, but also the papists themselves, clear him of fault; for they acknowledge, that *Calixtus* assailed their church more learnedly and ingeniously, than all the other Protestant doctors. Instead of all, hear *Jac. Benignus Bossuet*, who in his Traité de la communion sous les deux espèces, pt. i., § 2, p. 12, writes thus of him: Le fameux George Calixte, le plus habile des Lutheriens de nôtre tems, qui à écrit le plus doctement contre nous. *Calixtus* taught indeed, that as to *the foundation* of the faith, there was no dissension between us and the papists: and I wish he had omitted this altogether, or had expressed it in more fit and suitable terms. But he most constantly maintained, that upon the foundation of religion, the pontiffs and their adherents had based very many things, which no wise and good man should receive. And how much this should deduct from the odium and turpitude of that opinion, is manifest. I omit other aspersions of the memory of this great man, by those who think they ought to listen rather to his accusers, than to the accused himself. What then, you will say, *did* he mean?—*First*, this: that if it could be, that the Romish church should be recovered to the state in which it was in the five first centuries after Christ, the Protestants could then have no just grounds for refusing communion with it: and *secondly*, this: that among the adherents to the Roman pontiff, though as a body they were polluted with many and intolerable errors, those individuals should not be excluded from all hope of salvation nor be ranked with heretics, who honestly have imbibed what their fathers and their teachers have taught them, and who are prevented from seeing the truth, either in consequence of their ignorance or their education or by their early prepossessions; provided, they believe with simplicity whatever is contained in the *Apostles' Creed*, and study to conform their lives to the precepts of Christ. As I have already said, I do not stand forth as the patron of these opinions: they have patrons enough, at the present day: but this, I suppose, all will concede, that these views are

which, in addition to this purpose, were charged upon him as faults, and amplified in the manner of prosecutors, respected the less clear knowledge of the doctrine of the Trinity, in the times of the Old Testament; the necessity of good works to salvation; God's being, *accidentally*, the cause of sin; the visible appearances of the Son of God, under the ancient dispensation; and some few others; which were such, that if he really held them, they were of no great consequence, according to the acknowledgment of those whom no one will pronounce unfit judges of such questions; nor did they vitiate the marrow (so to speak) of divine truth. But in order to recommend that harmony among disagreeing Christians which he had in view, this excellent man had to assume two things, which appeared even worse than the design which they were intended to subserve. The first was, that the groundwork of Christianity, or those first and elementary principles from which all the other truths flow, remained sound and uncontaminated in all the three denominations of Christians. This groundwork, he supposed, was contained in that ancient formula called the *Apostle's Creed*. The second assumption was, that whatever is supported by the constant and uniform consent and authority of the ancient Christian fathers, who were ornaments to the five first centuries, must be regarded as equally true and certain, with what we find recorded in the holy scriptures. The *first* of these was the pillar that sustained the whole project he had in view: the *second* was of use, to excuse certain papal institutions and opinions which were very disagreeable to Lutherans, and to establish harmony among disagreeing Christians.

§ 24. These commotions and contests involved, though in different ways, the divines of Rinteln, Königsberg and Jena; to say nothing of some others. The divines of Rinteln, especially *John Henichius* and *Peter Musæus*, gave proof by many things, but most clearly in the conference at Cassel already mentioned, that they approved of the plan of *Calixtus* for terminating the contests among Christians, and especially among Protestants. And hence *they* too were attacked in various publications by the Saxon divines and such as took sides with them.(23) At Königsberg, *Christ. Dreyer*, a very learned man, *John Latermann* and *Michael Behm*, all pupils of *Calixtus*, signified pretty clearly, that they favoured the opinions of their instructer. Against them hostility was declared, not only by their colleagues *John Behm* and *Celestine Mislenta*, but likewise by the whole body of ministers at Königsberg. And the contest was protracted many years in such a manner, as brought honour to neither party in the view of posterity. This intestine war being extinguished, partly by the authority of the supreme magistrate, and partly by the death of *Behm* and *Mislenta*, *Dreyer* and his associates had to sustain another and a more permanent one, with those foreign divines who viewed the Calixtine opinions as pernicious, and the defenders of them as enemies to the church: nor can this foreign contest likewise be commended, either for its equity or its moderation.(24)

§ 25. In these commotions, the divines of Jena manifested uncommon

much more tolerable, than those with which he is commonly charged.

(23) See *Abrah. Calovius*, Historia Syncretistica, p. 618, &c. *Jo. Geo. Walch*, Introduction to the contests in the Lutheran church, [in German], vol. i., p. 286, &c.

(24) *Christopher Hartknoch's* Preussische Kirchenhistorie, book ii., ch. x., p. 602, &c., and others. *Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. iii., p. 150, &c. The Acts and Documents are in the Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1740, p. 144, A.D. 1742, p. 29, A.D. 1745, p. 91, and elsewhere.

prudence and moderation. For while they ingenuously confessed, that all the opinions of *Calixtus* could not easily be admitted and tolerated, without injury to the truth; they judged that most of his doctrines were not so very bad, as the Saxons supposed them to be; and that several of them might be tolerated, without the least hazard. *Solomon Glassius*, a man of great mildness, by order of *Ernesti* the *Pious*, duke of Saxe-Gotha, most equitably examined the importance of the several controverted points, in a work expressly on the subject.(25) *John Musæus*, a man of superior learning and uncommon acuteness, first determined that it was allowable to say, with *Calixtus* and *Horneius*, that in a certain sense good works are necessary to salvation; afterwards he maintained among his intimate friends, that little or no importance was attached to some of the other questions. These therefore, the Calixtine divines would not perhaps have refused as arbiters. But this moderation was so offensive to the Saxon divines, that they arraigned the school of Jena on suspicion of many errors, and declared that *John Musæus* in particular, had departed in not a few things from the sound faith.(26)

§ 26. These contests were succeeded and extinguished, by what are called the *Pietistic* controversies. These originated from those who undoubtedly with the best intentions, undertook to aid the cause of languishing piety, and to cure the faults both of the public teachers and of the multitude. But as often happens, they were amplified and aggravated by various sorts of persons, whose ill-informed understanding or heated imagination or some wrong bias of mind, led them to excite horrible commotions in one place and another, by their singular opinions, their pretended visions, their harsh and unintelligible rules for Christian conduct, and their very imprudent clamours about a total change of the forms and regulations of the church. The minds of slumbering Christians and also of such as bemoaned in secret the progress of irreligion, were first aroused by *Philip James Spener*, an excellent minister, and very highly esteemed both for his great piety and his extensive learning; when he set up private meetings at Frankfort, for the purpose of exhorting and training the people to piety, and afterwards when he set forth in a special treatise, his *Pious Desires*, (*Pia Desideria*), that is, his views of the evils existing in our church, and their remedies. Both met the approbation of very many, who had good and upright dispositions. But as many of them did not apply these remedies for diseased souls with sufficient caution and skill, and as those religious meetings (or *Colleges of Piety*, as they were denominated, in terms borrowed from the Dutch), enkindled in the minds of the multitude in several places, a wild and enthusiastic spirit, rather than true love to God; several complaints were soon heard, that under the pretence of aiding and advancing piety, solid religious knowledge was neglected, and fomentations applied to seditious and ill-balanced minds.(27)

(25) This judgment, drawn up in German, was first published after the death of Glassius, in 1662; and again a few years ago, at Jena, in 8vo. It is an example of theological moderation, and most worthy of an attentive perusal.

(26) With what faults the theologians of Jena and especially *Musæus*, were charged, may be best learned from the grave and solid work of *Musæus* himself, entitled, Der Jenischen Theologen ausführliche Erklärung über drey und neunzig vermeynte Religionsfragen, Jena, 1677 and 1704, 4to. Add *Jo. Geo. Walch's* Introduction to the controversies in the Lutheran church, [in German], vol. i., p. 405, &c.

(27) [On these controversies, it is proper to go back to the first causes. The long thirty years' war produced, throughout the whole Lutheran church, a very great pros-

§ 27. These first commotions would undoubtedly have gradually subsided, if still more violent ones had not supervened in 1689, at Leipsic. Certain pious and learned men, especially *Augustus Hermann Francke, John Casper*

tration of order, neglect of discipline, and profligacy: and the preachers were incompetent to meet this disordered state of things, which continued to exist after the return of peace. Some preachers were wholly incompetent to it: for the people had to choose such preachers as they could get; and among these, many were of indifferent talents and acquisitions. Others had no lack of native talent; but they had been ill instructed. For education was very differently conducted in the higher schools, then, from what it is now. The chief science then taught, was the dry and cloudy Aristotelian metaphysics; with which were connected scholastic dogmatics and polemics. Thus our theology was very dark and intricate, and such as was unfit for the pulpit and for common life: the heads of the preachers were full of technical terms and distinctions; and no one understood how to make the truths of Christianity intelligible to the common people. Besides, systematic and polemic theology were pursued; but moral theology, and biblical interpretation, were almost wholly laid aside. Of course the preaching was very poor; as is manifest from the postills of those times. The clergy preached from the lectures in the schools; and therefore, explained and proved the doctrines of faith, artificially; which the people could not understand: or they ornamented their sermons with quotations from the fathers, and from the heathen philosophers. They confuted errors and heresies, the very names of which frequently were unknown to their hearers; but they said little or nothing that was calculated to amend the hearts of their hearers; and they could say the less on such subjects, as they themselves often possessed unsanctified minds, or hearts in which pride, contentiousness, obstinacy, and a persecuting spirit predominated. Other clergymen, who were competent to instruct the people in true godliness, had not power to correct the disorders that had broken in; because the bad habits had become too deeply rooted, and the evil too inveterate. Hence there were in our church, various devout and upright persons, who sighed over this state of the church; and who wished to see godliness more cultivated, and the mode of teaching, both in the schools and from the pulpit, reformed. Among these persons, the first and most famous was *Spener*. He must be ranked among the most learned and the most devout ministers of our church; and together with most of the branches of theological science, he was well versed in history, and the auxiliary sciences; and had successively, as a preacher at Strasburg, an elder at Frankfort, and first court preacher at Dresden, obtained in all these offices, the reputation of a discreet, modest, and peaceable theologian. At Dresden he fell under the displeasure of the electoral prince, *John George* IV., who was much addicted to drunkenness, and to whom *Spener*, who was his confessor, as he was going to confession, addressed a very respectful letter, containing an earnest dissuasive from this bad habit. *Spener* next went to Berlin; and his migrations spread wider the Pietistic controversy. If any things are censurable in *Spener*, they are principally two things. *First*, he was not much of a philosopher, at least theoretically: and it is not much to be wondered at, that he should have little relish for the dry philosophy of those times. Besides, if he had possessed a taste for it, he would not have accomplished what he *did* accomplish. Still this deficiency led him sometimes, to reason inconclusively, and also not to see clearly the consequences of his propositions. *Secondly*, he was by nature too compliant and yielding. He could not say a hard thing to any man: and when he saw in a person any marks of piety, he at once recognised him as a brother, although he might hold erroneous doctrines. And this caused him much trouble, and led him to be often deceived by hypocrites. This was manifestly a consequence of his good natured character, which judged other men by himself; yet in some measure it obscured the greatness of his talents. Still, this weakness will hinder no impartial man from acknowledging, that *Spener* was really a great man; to whom we stand indebted, for the improvement of our mode of preaching, for more freedom in the manner of handling theological subjects, for the introduction of toleration towards other religious sects, and towards individuals who deviate from the common creed, and for the advancement of true godliness in our church. This last object, he endeavoured to effect especially by his *Colleges of Piety:* which he set up by the advice of some friends at Frankfort in 1670, first in his own house, and afterwards also in the church; partly to produce more cordial friendship, among those who were seeking to edify their souls; and partly to render the public preaching of God's word more profitable, by explaining the sermons delivered, by catechizing, by lectures on the Holy Scriptures, with prayer and

Schade, and *Paul Antony*, who were disciples and friends of *Spener*, then sustaining the office of first preacher at the Saxon court, and who were teachers of philosophy, supposed that candidates for the sacred office might be, and ought to be better trained for their employment, than the practice of the universities allowed; and therefore they undertook, themselves, to expound in the vernacular language certain books of the Holy Bible, in such a manner, as at the same time to infuse a spirit of solid piety into the minds of their hearers. This new and singular course allured great numbers to their lectures; many of whom exhibited the benefits they derived from these recitations, in lives and conduct very remote from the vicious habits of that age. Whether this first fervour of both the teachers and the learners, laudable and excellent in itself, was always kept within due bounds, it is not easy for any one to say; but this is certain, many, and they men of great authority, maintain that it was not; and public fame reports, that some things were brought forward and transacted, in those *Biblical Colleges* as they were called, which were in themselves indeed easy to be excused and borne with, if referred to moderate and candid judges, yet not a little variant from common usage and the laws of prudence. When great tumult arose, and the matter was brought to a judicial investigation, the learned men above named were pronounced innocent, or not

singing. The appellation, *Colleges of Piety*, was derived from Holland; where there is a party, who, from their meetings for worship which they call *Collegia*, are denominated *Collegiants*. (See below, chap. vii., § 1.) From them the name was derived, though *Spener's* meetings had no resemblance to the institutions of the Dutch Collegiants. To the establishment of these meetings, must be added a circumstance, which caused *Spener* much trouble. When *Arnd's* Postills were to be republished, in 1675, *Spener* composed a long preface to them; in which, together with his favourite doctrines of better times to come, the previous general conversion of the Jews, and the great downfall of popery, he also described the defects in our own church, and proposed some means for their remedy. Among these were, an improved mode of teaching in the higher schools, the better instruction of youth, the dispensing with metaphysics, and a zealous application to biblical interpretation and practical theology. This preface was afterwards printed separately in 1678, and entitled *Pia Desideria*. [The whole title of the book, which was written in German, was: Pia Desideria, or Earnest Desires for the Godly improvement of the true Evangelical church, with some Christian proposals for that object.—*Tr.*] It was well received by the majority, and was praised even by some who afterwards became its enemies. But after a while propositions were drawn from it, which were charged upon him as errors. The first attack was made by *Dilfeld*, a deacon at Nordhausen, who assailed the position that a true theologian must be a regenerate man. Greater disturbances arose from the meetings. Many imitated them; but they did not possess Spener's prudence. In some, there was no preacher to regulate the meeting; and there, all sorts of irregularity took place. In others, every one was allowed to speak; and of course speeches were often made, which contravened the standard evangelical doctrines, and ran into enthusiasm: and now visionaries and enthusiasts actually connected themselves with the followers of *Spener*. In small villages, they went on tolerably well: but in larger places, as Hamburg, for example, there were frequent commotions. And there in particular, *Jo. Fred. Mayer*, a Hamburg doctor, distinguished himself in a very offensive manner, by his carnal zeal against *Spener's* brother-in-law, *Jo. Henry Horbius*. See *Köhler's* Hist. Münzbelustigungen, vol. xvii., p. 363, &c. At Erfurt, Dantzic, Wolfenbüttel, Gotha, and even at Halle in Saxony, there were great commotions, which the magistrates had to still. *Spener* himself, when he saw the disorders that arose from these meetings, suppressed those *he* had set up. Others followed his example. But in many places, the people would not give them up: while yet they did not exercise sufficient prudence. The people frequently, began to forsake the public worship, and to run only to the meetings: and the blame was cast upon *Spener;* who was entirely innocent in this matter, and who by his preaching and his publications, explicitly opposed this wrong conduct.—*Schl.*]

guilty of the errors alleged against them; yet they were ordered to desist from the labours which they had commenced. In these commotions, the invidious name of *Pietists* was first heard of, or at least first publicly used. It was first imposed by some light-minded persons on those who attended these *Biblical Colleges*, and whose lives accorded with the precepts there inculcated: afterwards it was extended to all those who were supposed either to profess too rigid and austere principles of morals, or neglecting doctrinal truth, to refer all religion to mere piety. But as it is apt to be the fortune of names which designate particular sects, this name was not unfrequently applied in familiar discourse, to the very best of men, to those who were as careful to advance doctrinal truth, as piety: and on the other hand, it was very often applied to those who might more correctly be denominated the flagitious, the delirious, and fanatical.(28)

(28) [When *Spener* was called from Frankfort to Dresden, he had constantly with him a number of theological students, some of whom lodged in his house, and others boarded at his table, and whom he instructed how to discharge profitably the duties of preachers. Some of these went to Leipsic, to teach theology there, in accordance with *Spener's* prescriptions. Among these were *Aug. Herm. Francke*, and *Paul Antony*, both professors afterwards at Halle, *Jo. Casp. Schade*, afterwards a famous preacher at Berlin, and *Herm. van der Hart*, afterwards professor at Helmstadt. These commenced the Biblical Lectures. In these there was something new; for the lectures were given in German, *Luther's* translation was here and there amended, and the explanation of the Holy Scriptures was followed by religious exhortations. Concerning these Biblical Lectures, especially as the religious lectures of some of the professors were now more thinly attended, all sorts of rumours soon spread abroad, some of which were groundless, and others perhaps had some foundation. It was said, that not only students, but also labouring men and women, were admitted to them; and that every one present, was allowed to teach and to explain the Scriptures. Those who attended these lectures changed their manners and their dress, refrained from the customary amusements, and obtained the name of *Pietists;* (to which a severe funeral discourse of Dr. *Carpzov*, at the interment of a hearer of Mr. *Francke*, and the funeral Ode of *Lic. Feller* on the same occasion, wherein the import of the word and the characteristics of a Pietist were explained, are supposed principally to have contributed). In the year 1689, the court of Dresden appointed a commission to investigate this affair: but the accused masters, (especially *Francke*), obtained the famous *Christ. Thomasius* for their counsellor; who well defended them in a published judicial argument, and showed palpably, the nullity of the criminal process commenced against them; and they were acquitted of all criminality; though, at the same time, their biblical lectures were prohibited. But the thing shot like lightning, from Leipsic through the whole church. All who loved holiness, must have also such *Collegia* [or *Lectures:* for the Germans use the word *Collegia* in Latin, and *Collegien* in German, both for the *lectures* of professors in a university, and for associate *bodies of learned men:* so that *Collegia Biblica* may here be best translated *Biblical Lectures.*—*Tr.*] Thus the learned and the unlearned held meetings, which were called seasons for prayer and for devotion. Into these meetings, fantastical persons and enthusiasts insinuated themselves and talked of the millenial kingdom and the downfall of Babylon; railed against the clergy, and brought forward prophecies, and dreams, and visions. Hence there arose, in almost all places, Pietistic commotions; which the magistrates endeavoured to still, by severe laws. During these transactions, *Spener* was called from Dresden to Berlin; and *Thomasius*, of whom the Leipsic divines complained as being a heretic and a teacher of error, was obliged to flee to Halle. He it was, projected the establishment of the university of Halle; and *Spener* supported him. The university was established; and the very masters who had held the biblical lectures at Leipsic, were in part appointed the professors of theology in this new university. These commenced reading, according to *Spener's* views; and abolished the old scholastic method of teaching. They spoke disparagingly of philosophy; and said, that polemics made the people too disputatious; that the greatest *heresie* was, the *old Adam;* and that *he* especially must be combated. In place of polemic theology, they recommended mystic: and nearly all the mystical writings of the French and Italians, were translated and printed at the Orphan House in Halle. Persons who on account of their

§ 28. From Leipsic, this controversy spread with incredible rapidity, throughout Lutheran Germany, nay, through our whole church. For from this time onward, every where, in cities, villages, and hamlets, people suddenly started up, of all orders and classes, learned and illiterate, males and females; who pretended to be called by some divine impulse, to eradicate wickedness, to encourage and to propagate neglected piety, to regulate and govern the church of Christ more wisely; and who showed, partly by oral declarations, partly by their writings, and partly by their institutions, what should be done in order to effect the great object. Nearly all who were animated with this zeal, agreed, that there was no more powerful and salutary means for imbuing the people with a thorough knowledge of divine things, and with the love of holiness, than those private discussions and conventicles, which they understood were first instituted by *Spener* and were afterwards held at Leipsic. Meetings therefore of this kind, but of a different character, some better and others worse regulated, were opened in numerous places. These unusual and unexpected movements gave the more trouble and perplexity to those who had the oversight of the church and the state, because those upright and well meaning persons concerned in these meetings, were joined by many erratic and rash persons; who proclaimed the impending downfall of Babel,—(so they chose to call the Lutheran church),—alarmed and agitated the populace, by fictitious visions, and divine impulses; arrogated to themselves the authority of prophets of God; and not only obscured religious subjects by a gloomy jargon, of I know not whose coinage, but also recalled upon the stage opinions long since condemned; asserted, that the reign of a thousand years, mentioned by St. John, was at hand; and in short, plotted the overthrow of our best institutions; and demanded that the privilege of teaching, should be granted indiscriminately to all. Hence the Lutheran church was miserably rent into parties, to the joy of the papists; the most violent contests every where arose; and those who disagreed, more perhaps in terms and in external and indifferent things, than on doctrines of high moment, were arrayed against each other; and finally, in most provinces severe laws were enacted against those denominated *Pietists*.(29)

peculiar opinions, were not tolerated in other places, were received and provided for at Halle. While these things were going forward, the divines of Wittemberg, (for we pass over the attack of the Leipsic divines), in the year 1695, brought a formal accusation against *Spener*, as a teacher of error: and against this attack *Spener* defended himself energetically. It is certain, that the court of Dresden, in whose eye the university of Halle was a thorn, looked upon this attack with pleasure. From this time onward, our divines were divided into the *Orthodox* and the *Spenerian*. The theologians of Halle joined the party of their teachers; and thence arose a disquietude, which scarcely has a parallel.—*Schl*]

(29) For the illustration of these facts, in place of all others may be consulted, *Jo. Geo. Walch*, Introduction to the Controversies in our church, [in German,] vol ii and iii. He concisely states the various acts of this tragedy, enumerates the principal disputes, subjoining his own opinion, and every where mentions the authorities. A full and complete history, hardly any one man could compose, the transactions were so numerous and various. It is therefore to be wished, that some wise, considerate, and impartial persons, well acquainted with human nature and civil affairs, and well provided with the necessary documents, would undertake the composition of such a history. If certain persons were to collect from the public records and from various private papers, the transactions in particular districts, and then deliver over the whole to an individual, who should arrange, combine, and impart strength to the whole; the business would thus perhaps, be accomplished in the best manner it can be. Such a history, written with moderation and discretion, would be exceedingly useful, in very many ways.

§ 29. These restorers of piety were of two classes. Some proposed to advance the cause, and yet leave in full force, both the creed of the church as contained in our public formulas, and also its discipline and form of government. But others judged, that holiness could not possibly flourish among us, unless both the received doctrines were modified, and the whole internal organization and the customs of our church were changed. *Philip James Spener*, who removed from Dresden to Berlin in 1691, is justly considered as standing at the head of the former class. With him agreed, especially the theologians of the new university at Halle; among whom were *Augustus Hermann Francke* and *Paul Antony*, who had previously fallen under suspicion at Leipsic. The object of this class, no one much censured; nor could a man censure it, unless he wished to appear a bad man: yet many persons, and especially the theological faculty at Wittemberg, were of opinion that in the prosecution of this object, some principles were adopted and plans formed, which were injurious to the truth and adverse to the interests of the church. And this belief led them, publicly to accuse of many false and dangerous opinions, first, *Spener* in the year 1695, and afterwards his associates and friends, who defended the reputation of this great man. The vestiges of these contests are still so recent, that whoever is disposed, may easily learn with what degree of good faith, modesty, and equity they were conducted, on both sides.

§ 30. The subject matter of these controversies was manifold, and therefore it cannot be reduced to one grand point or be comprehended under one term. Yet if we consider the aims of those from whom they originated, the principal questions may be brought under certain heads. Those who laboured to advance the cause of piety, in the first place were of opinion, that the most strenuous opposers of their object were the very persons whose office it was to promote piety; namely, the teachers and ministers of the church. Hence they would commence with them; and would make it their especial care that none might become pastors of the Christian congregations, who were not properly educated, and also sanctified, or full of divine love. For this purpose; 1. They recommended the reformation of the theological schools. They would have the technical theology of the age, which embraced certain precise and minute questions and was wrapped up in unusual phaseology, to be laid aside; the controversies with other sects to be indeed not wholly neglected, yet less attended to; and the combination and intermixture of philosophy and human wisdom with the truths of revelation, to be wholly abolished. On the contrary, they thought that the young men designed for the ministry, should be led to read and meditate upon the holy scriptures; that a simple knowledge of the Christian religion, derived principally from the sacred volume, should be instilled into them; and that their whole education should be directed more to practical utility and the edification of Christians, and not so much for display and personal glory. As some of them perhaps, disputed on these subjects without sufficient precision and prudence, a suspicion arose with many, that these patrons of piety despised philosophy and the other branches of learning, altogether; that they rejected all solid knowledge in theology; that they disapproved of zeal in the defence of the truth, against its corruptors; and that they made theological learning to consist in a crude and vague power of declaiming about morals and practical duties. And hence arose the contests respecting the value of

philosophy and human science in religion, the dignity and utility of what is called *systematic* theology, the necessity of controversial theology, the value of mystical theology, the best method of instructing the people, and other similar questions. II. They taught that equal solicitude should be shown, that the future teachers in the churches might consecrate their hearts to God and be living examples of piety, as that they might carry away from the universities minds well fraught with useful knowledge. From this opinion, to which all good men readily assented, originated not only certain regulations suited to restrain the passions of studious youth and to awaken in them holy emotions and resolutions, but likewise that doctrine, which produced so much controversy, namely: That no one *can* teach others to be pious, or guide them to salvation, unless he is himself pious and a friend to God. Many supposed, that this doctrine both derogated from the efficacy of God's word, which cannot be frustrated by the imperfections of its ministers, and also led on to the long exploded errors of the Donatists; and especially as it was not stated with equal caution and prudence by all. And here commenced those long and difficult controversies, which are not yet terminated: Whether the knowledge of religion, which a wicked man may acquire, can be called theology? Whether a vicious man can have a true knowledge of religion? How far may the ministrations of an irreligious minister be efficacious and salutary? Whether illumination is ever given to a bad man whose heart is averse from God? and the like.

§ 31. These restorers of fallen piety, to render the people more obedient to their pious and properly educated teachers, and more resolute in opposing their own innate depravity, deemed it necesary, I. To suppress certain common expressions in the public instruction, which the depravity of men leads them not unfrequently to construe in a way to favour wickedness. Such were the following: that no person can attain in the present life, that perfection which the law of God demands: that good works are not necessary to salvation: that in the act of justification, faith only is concerned, and not also good works. But very many were afraid, if these barriers were removed the truth would be corrupted, or at least would be exposed naked and defenceless to its enemies. II. That stricter rules of conduct than are generally observed, should be inculcated; and that many things which foster the internal diseases of the mind, such as dancing, pantomimes, jocular discourse, plays, dramatic exhibitions, the reading of ludicrous books, and certain kinds of amusements, should be removed from the class of indifferent things, which are either good or bad according to the spirit and temper of those who engage in them, and should be classed among sinful and unlawful things. But many thought this morality too rigorous. Hence that old controversy of the schools was revived; whether there are certain actions, that are neither good nor evil but indifferent, or whether every thing men do, is either sinful or holy. And on each of the amusements enumerated, there were frequent and very warm debates, which were not always conducted with precision, temperance, and gravity. III. That in addition to the public assemblies for religious worship, there should be frequent private meetings for prayer and other religious exercises. But very many judged, and experience confirmed the opinion, that these *Colleges of piety* as they were called, were attended with more danger than profit. The minor contests respecting certain terms or plans, and

which did not originate from these sources, need not be mentioned.(30) But it is important to add, that the indulgence of those who were so earnest to promote piety, towards certain persons who were not perhaps bad men, but who either had feeble and uncultivated intellects, or were chargeable with no slight errors; exceedingly displeased many of the opposite party, and afforded them no little ground for suspicion, that they set a lower value upon truth and the theology contained in the symbolical books, than upon practical holiness. But among so great a multitude of combatants, and they men of various classes and tempers, it is not strange that there should have been many indiscreet persons, some over zealous, and others leaning towards the opposite faults to those which they wished to avoid.

§ 32. The other class of Pietists, or those who laboured to promote piety in a way that would lead to a change in the established doctrines of the Lutheran community, and to a modification of the whole form and constitution of the church, were men of various characters. Some of them, destitute of a sound understanding, were not so much errorists, as men whose reason and judgment were impaired: others modified the fictions, which they either derived from the works of others or invented themselves, with some portion of sound doctrine. We shall mention only some of the better sort of them, and such as acquired a high reputation. —*Godfrey Arnold*, of Anneberg in Saxony, a man of much reading, of a good understanding, and of natural eloquence, disturbed the close of the century by various writings, but especially by his History of the church and of heresies, which, certainly without just grounds, he entitled an *impartial* history.(31) By nature melancholy, gloomy, and austere, he applied himself to the reading of the works of the *Mystics* whom he greatly resembled, till his mind was so wrought up, that he regarded them as the wisest men in the world, made all religion to consist in certain indescribable internal sensations and emotions, had little regard for doctrinal theology, and expended all the powers of his genius in collecting and exaggerating the faults of our own and former times. If as all admit, it is the first excellence of an historian to afford no ground for a suspicion of either partiality or enmity, no man was ever more unfit to be an historian, than *Godfrey Arnold*. The man must be unable to see or feel at all, who can read his history, and yet say, that he does not see and feel, that it is throughout dictated by passion, and strong hatred of the received doctrines and institutions [of our church]. *Arnold* in his history assumes it as an undeniable fact, that all the evils which have crept into the Christian church since the times of the apostles, have originated from the ministers and rulers of the church, who were wicked and ungodly men. On this assumption, he supposes, that all who made opposition to the priests and ministers of religion, and who suffered persecution from them, were pious and holy men: and on the other hand, that such as pleased the clergy, were erratic

(30) All these controversies were first collected and arranged, though unduly multiplied, by *Sam. Schelwig*, in his Synopsis controversiarum sub pietatis prætextu motarum: first published, Dantzic, 1701, 8vo. But they may be better learned, together with the arguments of both parties, from *Joachim Lange's* Antibarbarus; and from his German work, entitled the Middle Way (die Mittelstrasse); and also from *Val. Ern. Löscher's* Timotheus Veterinus, which is extant in two volumes.

(31) [*Gottfrid Arnold's* unparthevische Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie: first published 1699 and 1700, in 2 vols. fol., and then more full and complete, Schaffhausen, 1740, in three very thick vols. fol.—*Tr.*]

and averse to true piety. Hence he defends nearly all the *heretics*, even those whose doctrines he had not examined and did not well understand; and this has caused his book to give the highest offence. But the longer he lived, the more he saw the errors into which he had been betrayed by his natural temperament and by bad examples; and as respectable persons affirm, he at last became more friendly to the truth and to moderation.(32)

§ 33. A much worse man than he, was *Jo. Conrad Dippel*, a Hessian who assumed the fictitious name of *Christian Democritus*, and who disquieted the minds of the weak, and excited no inconsiderable commotions, in the last part of this century. This man, in my view, arrogant, vainglorious, and formed by nature to be a caviller and a buffoon, did not so much bring forward a new form of religion, as labour to overthrow all those that he found established. For during his whole life, he was more intent on nothing, than on running down every religious community, and especially that of the Lutherans in which he was born, with his sarcastic witticisms; and rendering whatever had long been viewed with reverence, as ridiculous as possible, by his malignant and low scurrility. If he had any clear conceptions, which I very much doubt, for invention and imagination were by far his most prominent characteristics,—if, I say, he had in his own mind any clear and distinct conceptions which he thought were true, he certainly was incompetent to unfold them clearly, or to express them in words; for it is only by divination, that a man can draw from his various writings any coherent and uniform system of doctrine. Indeed, it would seem as if the fire of his laboratory, over which he spent so much time, had produced a fever in his brain. The writings he composed in a crude, bitter, and sarcastic style, should they be handed down to posterity, will cause people to wonder, that so many of their fathers could admit for their religious teacher and guide, one who so audaciously violated every principle of good sense and piety.(33)

(32) See *Cöler's* Life of Arnold, Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. Crit., tome i., p. 485, &c. [*Dr. Mosheim* does not appear to me, to do justice to *Arnold* as a historian. At least, I have not discovered in his history that malignity and disregard for truth, which *Dr Moshcim* thinks every man who has eyes, must see. *Arnold* was born at Anneberg in 1665. After passing his childhood at school in his native place, he spent three years in the gymnasium at Gera; and then, in 1685, entered the University of Wittemberg, where the next year he took his master's degree. Inclined to a retired and noiseless life, he removed to Dresden in 1686; where he became a private tutor, and was intimate with *Spener*. In 1693, he removed to Quedlingburg; and there acted as a private tutor in a family, four years, declining repeated offers of a parish. In 1697, he was appointed professor of history at Giessen: but relinquished the office after two years; because, he said, No man can serve two masters: and professors, at that day, were required to teach in a manner that did not suit his taste. He returned to Quedlingburg in 1698; where he was much admired and followed by the Pietists. In the year 1700, *Sophia Charlotte*, duchess of Isenach, by recommendation of professor *Francke*, made him her court preacher. But opposition from the orthodox obliged him to quit the place, in 1705; and he was made pastor and inspector of Werben. Two years after, the king of Prussia made him pastor and inspector at Perleberg; where he died in 1713, aged 48. He was of a melancholy temperament, and drank deeply into the views of the Mystics and the Pietists, and conceived high disgust with the reigning theology around him. But he appears to have been a perfectly ingenuous and upright man. As an historian, he doubtless had strong prejudices, which often warped his judgment. But he appears to me very far from being a *passionate* writer; or from attempting, designedly, to discolour or misrepresent facts. See the character of him drawn by *C. W. F. Walch*, in his elaborate Preface to *Von Einem's* translation of Mosheim, vol. i., p. 88–101.—*Tr.*]

(33) All his works were printed in 5 vols.

§ 34. Of a totally different character, was *John William Petersen*, superintendent at Luneburg; a man of a mild and quiet temper, but of a feeble mind, and from the luxuriance of his imagination, very liable to deceive both himself and others. In the first place, he contended in the year 1691, that a noble young lady, *Rosamond Juliana* of Asseburg, whose disordered brain made her the subject of a sort of visions, actually saw God present and reported commands which she received from him; and about the same time, he publicly defended the obsolete doctrine of Christ's future reign of a thousand years on the earth: for that oracle had confirmed this among other things, by *her* authority. This first error, as is usual with those who have no control over their own minds, afterwards produced others. For he with his wife, *Joanna Eleanora* of Merlau, who also professed to have very great spiritual knowledge, predicted a complete future restoration of all things, or the liberation of both wicked men and devils from hell, and their deliverance from all sin and from the punishment of sin; and he assigned to Christ a twofold human nature, the one celestial and assumed before this world was created, and the other derived from his mother since the commencement of time. I pass over other opinions of this pair, equally groundless, and very wide of the common belief. Many persons gave assent to these opinions, especially among the laity: but *Petersen* was also opposed by great numbers; to whom he replied very fully, as he had a fruitful genius and abundance of leisure. Being removed from his office in the year 1692, he quietly passed the remainder of his life on his estate, near Magdeburg, amusing himself with writing letters and books.(34)

4to, in the year 1747, but without naming the place of publication. For he was respected by many after his death, and regarded as a great teacher of true wisdom. None more readily find readers and patrons, than those who abuse every body else, and immoderately extol themselves. *Dippel* also acquired numerous friends, by his attention to chymistry, in which he is said to have been well versed, and by his medical knowledge. For as all men are fond of riches and long life, they readily set a high value on those who professedly show them a sure path to opulence and old age. The death of *Dippel* is related by numerous writers.

(34) *Petersen* gave a history of his own life, in German, first published in 1717, 8vo, to which his wife added her life, in 1718. Those who wish to investigate the spirit, habits, and character of this well-matched pair, will find matter enough for their purpose, in these auto-biographies. Concerning his movements at Lüneburg, see the Documents in the Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1748, p. 974, A.D. 1749, p. 30, 200, and in many other places. Add *Jo. Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. ii., p. 639, &c. [This pious and amiable enthusiast was born at Osnabruck, in 1649. Nature formed him for a poet; as appears from his Urania, on the mighty works of God, which *Leibnitz* published with his own amendments. He was made professor of poetry at Rostock, in 1677. Afterwards, he was superintendent at Lubec; then court preacher at Lutin, and in 1688, superintendent at Lüneburg. He early gave way to a belief in visions and special revelations; which brought him to hold to a literal reign of Christ on the earth during the millennium, and to believe in a final restoration of all things. Becoming more and more confirmed in these sentiments, he openly avowed them, both orally and in printed works. In 1692, he was cited before the consistory at Zelle: and as he could not conscientiously refrain from teaching doctrines, which he supposed immediately revealed to himself and wife and lady *Juliana*, he was deprived of his office; and purchasing an estate not far from Magdeburg, he there led a retired and religious life, chiefly occupied in defending his principles, and in labouring to promote practical piety, till his death in 1727. He was undoubtedly a considerable scholar, and a very sincere and pious man. But his poetic imagination, and his belief in dreams and visions, led him to embrace very singular opinions. He supposed, that prior to the millennium, the gospel would be preached over all the world; and that all nations would be converted. The Jews after becoming Chris-

§ 35. I know not whether I ought to associate with these, *John Caspar Schade*, and *John George Bœsius*, good men, and earnest to promote the salvation of others, but ignorant of the way to effect it. The former was a minister at Berlin, and among the other crude and ill-digested doctrines which he advanced, he in 1697, most strenuously opposed the confession of sins to priests which is practised among the Lutherans. His zeal on this subject produced considerable commotion, both in the church and the state. The latter was a preacher at Sorau [in lower Lusatia], and in order more effectually to overcome the heedlessness and security of men, he denied, that God continues to be propitious to those sinners whose obstinacy he eternally foresaw would be incurable, to the end of their lives; or, what is the same thing, that, beyond a certain limited time fixed from eternity, he would afford them the grace necessary for the attainment of salvation. This opinion was thought by not a few divines to be injurious to the divine mercy, which is boundless; and it was therefore combated in many publications. Yet it found a learned vindicator in *Adam Rechenberg*, a divine of Leipsic; not to mention others of less note.(35)

§ 36. Among the minor controversies in the Lutheran church, I shall assign the first place to that which existed between the divines of Tubingen and those of Giessen, from the year 1616 onward. The grand point in debate, related to the true nature and circumstances of that state of *Christ*, which theologians usually call his state of *humiliation*. The parties agreed, that the *man* Christ Jesus really possessed divine properties and perfections, by virtue of the *hypostatic union*, even while he seemed divested of all glory and majesty and appeared to be a vile servant and malefactor. But they disputed, whether he actually *divested* himself of the use of those perfections while executing the office of high priest, or whether he only *concealed* his use of them from the view of men. The divines of Tubingen accounted the latter supposition to be the fact; while those of Giessen, regarded the former as more probable. To this first and great question, others were added; which, if I am correct, were rather curious than necessary, respecting the mode in which God is present throughout the created universe, the origin and ground of this presence,

tians, would be restored to their own land. Then the first resurrection, that of the ancient saints and martyrs, would take place; Christ would appear in the clouds of heaven; and living saints would be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and be changed. Thenceforth Christ would reign a thousand years on the earth, over a twofold church; the celestial, composed of the risen saints and those changed at his coming, and the terrestrial, embracing all other Christians. Religion would prevail very generally, but not universally. At the end of the thousand years, Satan would be let loose; there would be a great apostacy; Christ would come forth and destroy the wicked; a new heaven and a new earth would appear; and gradually, all things would be restored to order, and holiness, and happiness. Though *Petersen* was first led into these doctrines, by supposed revelations, and appears always to have founded his *own* belief chiefly on such grounds; yet he believed, that the Scriptures rightly interpreted, that is, mystically explained, were full of these doctrines. And hence, in order to convince others, he argued much from the Bible, particularly from the Apocalypse; and also from the ancient Chiliasts, especially *Origen*. His writings were voluminous; consisting of mystic interpretations of Scripture, defence of his peculiar sentiments, many letters, and a history of his own life. See *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, vol. viii., p. 302, &c. Unpartheyische Kirchenhistoire, Jena, 1730, vol. ii., p. 811, &c.—*Tr.*]

(35) Those who wish to understand these controversies, may consult *Walch's* Introduction to the controversies in the Lutheran church, written in German.

the true cause of the omnipresence of Christ's body, and some others. On the side of the Tubingen divines, appeared and took part *Lucas Osiander*, *Melchior Nicolai* and *Theodore Thummius*; and on the side of the divines of Giessen, *Balthazar Menzer*, and *Justus Feuerborn:* all of whom contended ardently and ingeniously; and I wish I could add, always with dignity and moderation. But those times permitted and approved many things, which subsequent times have justly required to be amended. The Saxon theologians in the year 1624, by order of their sovereign, assumed the office of arbiters of the controversy: and this office they so executed, as not to approve entirely the sentiments of either party; yet they intimated, that the views of the Giessen divines were nearer the truth, than those of the other party.(36) The Tubingen divines refused to admit their interference: and perhaps, the divines of Giessen would in time have done the same. But the public calamities of Germany, put an end to the contest. It was therefore never settled; but each party retained its own views.

§ 37. Not long after the rise of this contest, in the year 1621, *Herman Rathmann*, a pious and not unlearned minister of the gospel at Dantzic, a great friend and a public recommender of *John Arnd's* work on True Christianity, was thought by *John Corvinus* his colleague, and by many others, to derogate from the majesty and the efficacy of the holy scriptures. If we may believe his opposers, he published in the year 1621, in a German work on Christ's gracious kingdom, the following sentiment: That the written word of God, does not possess inherent power and efficacy, to enlighten and regenerate the hearts of men and to convert them to God: that this external word merely points out the way to salvation, but does not draw men into it: that God himself, by another and an internal word, so changes the disposition of men, that they are enabled to please him. This opinion, *Corvinus* and his associates contended, was the same that *Schwenkfeld* formerly held, and that the Mystics professed. But whoever shall compare together all the writings of *Rathmann* on the subject, will perceive, that his adversaries either did not understand him, or have perverted his meaning. He supposed, I. That the word of God as contained in the scriptures, had indeed the power of converting men to God, and of renewing their hearts. But, II. This power it could not exert at all, on the minds of corrupt men who resisted it. Therefore, III. It was necessary, that a divine power should either precede or accompany it, and prepare the minds of men for its influence, or remove the obstacles which de-

(36) *Jo. Wolfg. Jaeger's* Historia eccles. et polit. sæculi xvii., decenn. iii., p. 329, &c. *Christ. Eberh. Weismann's* Historia eccles. sæcul. xvii., p. 1178. *Walch's* Introduction to the controversies, &c. [in German], pt. i., ch. iv., p. 206: to say nothing of *Andr. Carolus*, *Arnold*, and a hundred others. [These controversies were natural results of *Luther's* untenable doctrine of consubstantiation; which supposed Christ's body and blood to be always truly present with the bread and wine of the eucharist. For on that supposition, Christ's body must often be present in a great number of places at the same time, or have a kind of *ubiquity*. To render this at all plausible, resort was had to the *hypostatic union*, and to a supposed transfer of divine attributes from the superior nature of Christ to the inferior. Thus the attributes of *matter* and of *mind* were confounded; and a local or material presence was ascribed to the divine nature. From such absurd doctrines, stiffly maintained by acute and ingenious men, it was unavoidable that they should feel the difficulties besetting them on every side; and therefore should start various theories, with the vain hope of extricating themselves from embarrassment.—*Tr.*]

stroyed the efficacy of the external word. And thus, IV. By this power of the Holy Spirit, or this internal word, the way was prepared for the external word to enlighten and renovate the souls of men.(37) There is indeed some difference, between his views of the efficacy of the divine word, and the common views of the Lutheran church: but if I do not greatly deceive myself, whoever shall carefully consider all that he has written on the subject, in his inelegant, nay, often careless manner, will be convinced that this difference is but small; and he will perceive, that this honest man had not the power of communicating his thoughts with precision and clearness. The controversy spread through the whole Lutheran church, the majority following the example of the Saxons and condemning *Rathmann*, but others excusing that pious and good man. But as he died, just as the contest was at its height, in the year 1628, the great commotions gradually subsided.

§ 38. The private dissensions of some of the doctors respecting certain propositions and opinions, I do not presume to place on the list of Lutheran controversies: though I perceive, some do it; not so much however, if I do not mistake, for the purpose of illustrating and adorning the history of the Lutheran church, as to create prejudice against it, and to lower the reputation of good men. For no age is so happy, and no community so well regulated, but that one individual is sometimes deemed by another to be indiscreet and erroneous. Nor is it estimating human nature correctly, to measure the state of things throughout a whole church, by such private opinions of individuals. In the writings of *John Tarnovius* and *John Affelmann* of Rostock, in other respects two very meritorious theologians, certain modes of expression and some opinions were censured, by their colleagues and others. Nor will this excite much surprise in one who considers, that the latter might misunderstand what was itself well said, and that the former might not have known how to express correctly what they clearly understood.—*Joachim Lütkemann*, in many respects a man of worth, denied, that Christ remained a true *man*, during the three days that he was dead: while others affirmed the contrary. This was a controversy about words; such as we see continually arising and disappearing among men.—Of the same kind, was the dispute between *Henry Boetius* a theologian of Helmstadt, and *Frederic Baldwin* a divine of Wittemberg; whether it is in consequence of the merits of Christ, that the wicked will be restored to life hereafter.—*John Reinboth*, superintendent in Holstein, like *Calixtus*, circumscribed the essentials of religion within narrower limits than usual, and supposed that the Greeks did not err essentially, in denying that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Son. In both respects, many were satisfied with him; but others were not; and especially, *John Conrad Danhauer*, a very learned divine of Strasburg. Hence a controversy arose between those excellent men, which was more vehement, than the nature of the case demanded.(38) But let us not refer disputes of this character to the class of those which show the internal state of our church in this century.

(37) See *Christopher Hartknock's* Preussische Kirchengeschichte, book iii., ch viii., p. 812, &c. *Godfrey Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhist., pt. iii., ch. xii., p. 115, &c. *Jo. Moller's* Cimbria Lit., tom. iii., p. 559, &c.

(38) See on these controversies generally, *Godfrey Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. ii., book xvii., ch. vi., p. 957, &c., and concerning that of *Reinboth* in particular, see *Jo. Möller's* Introduct ad Historiam Chersonesus Cimbricæ, pt. ii., p. 190, &c., and Cimbria Litterata, tom. ii., p. 692.

§ 39. Of somewhat greater moment in this respect, were some controversies, which did not relate so much to things as to persons; or respected the soundness and correctness of certain teachers. Men who undertake to plead the cause of piety and holiness, are often carried by the fervour which actuates them to some extravagance; and therefore do not always confine down their statements to the rigid rules of theological accuracy as prescribed by learned divines: and they sometimes borrow the strong and splendid yet figurative and often obscure words and phrases of those, who treat of the genuine worship of God and of practical duties, with good intentions indeed, yet in a rude and uncouth style. Hence none scarcely, more readily than these, fall under the suspicion of despising and marring the truth. Many such examples occurred in this age; and particularly in the case of *Stephen Prætorius*, a preacher at Salswedel, and of that most excellent man, *John Arnd*. The former had published in the preceding century, some tracts calculated to arouse the minds of men to solicitude about their salvation; and these were repeatedly republished in this century, and commended by many; and yet were thought by others to abound in expressions and sentiments, either directly false or calculated to lead on to error. And there certainly are some unsuitable expressions in those tracts, which might easily mislead the ignorant; and some also, that indicate too great credulity. Yet whoever shall read his works with an ingenuous mind, will easily believe that the writer wrote nothing there, treacherously, and with a bad design. The celebrated work of *Arnd* on true Christianity, the perusal of which affords delight to so many persons even in our own times, was too bitterly taxed by *Lucas Osiander*, *George Rost*, and many others, with being written among other faults in a style that was debased by Weigelian, Paracelsic, and the like phraseology. And it is certain, that this extraordinary man disliked the philosophy that prevailed in the schools of that age, and on the other hand ascribed much—I had almost said, too much—to the doctrines and pretensions of the chymists: and hence he sometimes used the language of those who tell us, that fire throws light on both religion and nature. But he has been absolved from all great errors, by the most respectable men, especially by *Paul Egard*, *Daniel Dilger*, *Melchior Breler*, *John Gerhard*, *Dorscheus*, and numerous others: and indeed, he appears to have derived reputation and renown, rather than disgrace, from those many criminations.(39) To the class of which we here treat, belongs also *Valentine Weigel*, minister of Tschopau in Meissen. For though he died in the preceding century, yet a great part of his writings were first published in this, and were attacked by great numbers. I regard him as by no means a corrupt man; but he also was injured by his attachment to the chymistry which at that time floated about Germany, and by his dislike or neglect of the precepts of sound reason.(40)

§ 40. It remains, that we notice the chief persons among the Lutherans, who felt themselves strong enough to new model the whole system of theology, or to draw forth a new one from their own resources. At the head

(39) See *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhist., pt. ii., book xvii., ch. vi., p. 940, &c. *Weismann's* Historia Eccles. sæculi xvii., p. 1174, 1189. *Godfr. Balth. Scharf's* Supplement. hist., litisque Arndianæ, Wittemb., 1727, 8vo, and very many others.

(40) *Arnold* treats largely of Weigel; yet, as usual, not impartially; in his Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. ii., b. xvii., ch. xvii., p. 1088.

of the list stands *Jacob Bœhmen*, a shoemaker of Gorlitz, famous for his vast number of both friends and foes, and whom his patrons call the *German Theosophist*. Being naturally inclined to search after abstruse things, and having learned, partly from certain books, and partly from intercourse with some physicians, (*Tobias Kober*, *Balthasar Walther*, and others), the doctrines of *Robert Fludd* and the Rosecrucians, which were then every where circulated and talked of, he discovered by means of fire, and with the aid of his imagination, a kind of theology which was more obscure than the numbers of Pythagoras or the characters of Heraclitus. Those who would commend the man for ingenuity, piety, veracity and honesty, may do it without hinderance from us: but those who would honour him with the title of a man taught by God, or even of a sound and wise philosopher, must themselves lack knowledge; for he so confuses every subject, with chymical metaphors, and with such a profusion of obscure terms, that it would seem as if he aimed to produce jargon. The heat of his exuberant fancy, if I do not mistake, led him to believe, that divine grace operates by the same laws as prevail in the physical world; and that men's souls are purified from their pollution and vices, in the same way in which metals are purged from dross. He formerly had, and he still has, a very great number of followers; among whom the most noted and famous in this century were *John Lewis Giftheil*, *John Angelus von Werdenhagen*, *Abraham von Franckenberg*, *Theodore von Tzetsch*, *Paul Felgenhauer*, *Quirinus Kuhlman*, *John James Zimmerman*, and others. Some of these were not altogether destitute of modesty and good sense: but others were entirely beside themselves, and excited the compassion of intelligent men; as, e. g., *Kuhlmann*, who was burned in Muscovy A.D. 1684, and afterwards *Gichtel:* and not one of them managed their affairs so laudably and well, as to procure for the sect or its founders any degree of respect and commendation with persons of the slightest discernment.(41)

§ 41. Next after *Bœhmen*, it appears should be mentioned those, whom disordered minds rendered so presumptuous, that they claimed to be prophets, divinely raised up and endued with the power of foretelling future events. A large number of such persons existed in this age, and particularly during the times when the Austrians were contending for supremacy against the Germans, the Swedes, and the French: for long experience shows, that there is never a greater number of diviners or prophets, than when great revolutions seem about to take place, or when great and unexpected calamities occur. The most noted of these were, *Nicholas Drabiz*, *Christopher Kotter*, and *Christina Poniatowsky*, who have found an eloquent patron in *John Amos Comenius;* also *Joachim Greulich*, *Anna Vetteria*, *Eva Maria Frölich*, *George Reichard*, and some others. But as no one of them was the cause of any great commotions, and as the progress of events very soon divested

(41) It is not necessary here to cite authorities; for the works of *Bœhmen* are in every body's hands, and the books which confute him are no where scarce. What can be said in favour of the man and his followers, may be seen in *Arnold*, who is always most full in extolling and lauding those whom others censure. Concerning *Kuhlmann*, and his execution, see the Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1748, p. 905, and in many other places.—[" *Bœhmen*, however, had the good fortune to meet with, in our days, a warm advocate and an industrious disciple in the late well-meaning, but gloomy and visionary Mr. *William Law*, who was, for many years, preparing a new edition and translation of *Bœhmen's* works, which he left behind him ready for the press, and which have been published in 2 vols. 4to, since his death."—*Macl.*]

their predictions of all their authority, it is sufficient to have shown generally, that there were among the Lutherans of this age, some disordered minds, that affected the honours and the authority of ambassadors of heaven.(42)

§ 42. I would give a somewhat more distinct account of some, who were not indeed so wholly beside themselves as to claim to be prophets of God, yet sadly deceived themselves and others by marvellous and strange opinions. *Esaias Stiefel* and *Ezekiel Meth*, both of Thuringia, not long after the commencement of the century, expressed themselves so unusually and so improperly, that they were thought by many to arrogate to themselves divine glory and majesty, to the great dishonour of God and our Saviour. I can believe, that though they greatly lacked sound sense, yet they were not so far beside themselves; and that they only foolishly imitated the lofty and swollen phraseology of the mystical writers. Thus they may serve as examples, to show how much cloudiness and folly, the constant reading of mystical books may spread over uncultivated and feeble minds.(43) *Paul Nagel*, a professor at Leipsic who had some tincture of mathematical knowledge, conjectured from the indications of the stars, future occurrences both in church and state; and among other things professed to be certain, from their indications, that a very holy and heavenly kingdom of Christ was to be set up on the earth.(44)

§ 43. *Christian Hoburg*, of Luneburg, a man of an unstable and restless spirit, under the assumed names of *Elias Prætorius* and *Bernard Baumann*, published a vast number of invectives against the whole Lutheran church; and thereby involved himself in various troubles. Yet for a long time, by dissimulation and deception, which he doubtless supposed to be lawful, he led the more charitable to regard him as less faulty than he actually was; and he was accounted an acrimonious assailant, not so much of religion itself, as of the licentiousness and vices of those especially who ministered in holy things. At length however, he rendered himself universally odious, and went over to the Mennonites.(45) Very similar to him, though superior in petulance and acrimony, was *Frederic Breckling;* who being ejected from the ministry, which he first exercised in Holstein and afterwards at Zwoll in Holland, continued to extreme old age in Holland, connected with no religious sect. Various of his tracts are extant, which, although they vehemently urge and recommend the cultivation of piety, and display implacable hatred against both vice and the vicious, yet show the writer to

(42) *Godfrey Arnold* has done the world service, by accurately collecting the visions and acts of these people, in the second and third Parts of his Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie. For now, such as have occasion to investigate the subject, have the ready means of ascertaining with certainty, what was in itself most probable beforehand, that what these persons deemed divine communications, were the fictions of their own minds led away by their imaginations. There was an honest, illiterate man at Amsterdam, in the middle of the seventeenth century, *Benedict Buhusen* of Holstein, who was so captivated with such writings and prophecies, that he carefully collected and published them all. His Index Bibliothecæ, was printed after his death, Amsterd., 1670, 4to, embracing a great number of chymical, fanatical, and prophetical writings.

(43) See *Christ. Thomasius*, Historie der Weisheit und Narheit, vol. i., pt. iii., p. 150. *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, pt. iii., ch. iv., p 32.

(44) *Arnold*, loc. cit., pt. iii., ch. v., p. 53. *Andrew Carolus*, Memorabila Eccles. sæc. xvii., pt. i., lib. iii., cap. iv., p. 513.

(45) *Arnold*, loc. cit., pt. iii., ch xiii., p. 130. *Andrew Carolus*, loc. cit., vol i., p. 1065. *Jo Hornbeck*, Summa Controvers., p. 535. *Jo. Möller*, Cimbria Litterata, tom. ii., p. 337, &c.

have been destitute of the primary virtues of a truly pious man, charity, wisdom, the love of truth, meekness and patience.(46) It is strange, that such vehement and heated declaimers against the defects of the public religion and its ministers, as they profess to be more discerning than all others, should fail of discovering, what the most simple daily learn by common observation, that nothing is more odious and disgusting than an angry reformer, who is always laying about him with sword and dagger; and that they should not perceive, that it is scarcely possible for any one successfully to cure in others, the faults of which he is himself guilty. The expectation of the millennial kingdom, which seldom exists in well-informed minds, and which generally produces extravagant opinions, was embraced and propagated by *George Lawrence Seidenbecher*, a preacher in the Saxon region of Eichsfeld: and for this, he was deprived of his office.(47)

§ 44. We shall close the list of this sickly family, (for it is not necessary to name a great number, since they all pursued much the same course), with the most odious and the worst of them all, *Martin Seidelius*, a Silesian of Ohlau; who laboured to establish a sect in Poland and the neighbouring countries, near the close of the preceding century and the commencement of this, but whose extreme absurdities prevented his meeting with success even among the Socinians. This most daring of mortals supposed, that God had indeed promised a Saviour or a Messiah to the Jewish nation; but that this Messiah had never appeared, nor ever would appear, because the Jews by their sins had rendered themselves unworthy of this so great a deliverer promised of old to their fathers: that of course, *Christ* was erroneously regarded as the Messiah; that it was his only business and office to explain the law of nature, which had been greatly obscured by the fault of men; and therefore, that whoever shall obey this law as expounded by Jesus Christ, will fulfil all the religious duties which God requires of him. To render these monstrous opinions more defensible and specious, he audaciously assailed and discarded all the books of the New Testament. The few persons whom he brought over to his views, were called *Semi-Judaizers*.(48) If this rash man had lived at the present day, he would have appeared much less odious, than he did in that age. For if we except his singular ideas concerning the Messiah, all the rest of his system would be highly approved by many at the present day, among the English, the Dutch, and other nations.

(46) *Arnold* treats of this man, in his work so often cited, pt. iii., ch. xiii., p. 148, &c., and likewise gives us some of his tracts; which abundantly show the extreme fertility of his genius; ibid., p. 1110. A formal account of him, is given by *John Möller*, Cimbria Litterata, tom. iii., p. 72, &c.

(47) He is fully described by *Alb. Meno Verpoorten*, in his Comment. de vita et institutis G. L. Seidenbecheri; Dantzic, 1739, 4to.

(48) See *Gustav. Geo. Zeltner's* Historia Crypto-Socinismi Altorfini, vol. i., p. 268, 335. [His Fundamenta religionis Christianæ and his Epistolæ tres ad cœtum Unitariorum, are to be found in the Bibliotheca fratrum Unitariorum.—*Schl.* A sect still exists in Russia, holding much the same doctrines, and bearing the name of *Seleznevtschini*. See *R. Pinkerton's* Present state of the Greek Church, ed. New-York, 1815, p. 273, comp. p. 228.—*Tr.*]

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

§ 1. Enlargement of the Reformed Church.—§ 2. Its Decrease. Fall of the French Church.—§ 3. Persecutions of the Reformed French Church —§ 4. Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.—§ 5. Persecutions of the Waldensians and the Palatines.—§ 6. State of Learning and Philosophy.—§ 7. Biblical Interpretation.—§ 8. Dogmatic Theology. —§ 9. State of Moral Theology.—§ 10. Controversies concerning Grace and Predestination.—§ 11. The Arminian Schism.—§ 12 Its Effects —§ 13. Singular Opinions of the French Church.—§ 14. Contest of the Hypothetical Universalists.—§ 15. La Place and Cappel.—§ 16. Lewis le Blanc.—§ 17, 18. Claude Pajon.—§ 19. State of the English Church under James I.—§ 20. Charles I.—§ 21. The Independents.—§ 22. Cromwell's Reign.—§ 23. English Antinomians.—§ 24. Latitudinarians.—§ 25. Church of England under Charles II. and his Successors.—§ 26. High Church or Non-Jurors, among the English.—§ 27. Their Opinions.—§ 28. Contests among the Dutch —§ 29. The Cartesian and Cocceian Controversies.—§ 30. The Cartesian.—§ 31. The Opinion of the Cocceians respecting the Holy Scriptures.—§ 32. Their Theological Opinions.— § 33. Roëllian Contest, respecting the Use of Reason.—§ 34. Respecting the Generation of the Son of God, &c.—§ 35. Becker.—§ 36. Dutch Sects. Verschorists, Hattemists. —§ 37. Commotions in Switzerland. The Formula Consensus.

§ 1. The Reformed church, as has been already remarked, being united not so much by the bonds of a common faith and discipline, as by principles of moderation and candour, it will be proper to consider, first, whatever relates to this very extensive community as a whole, and then the events worthy of notice in the several Reformed countries. The principal enlargements of this community in the seventeenth century, have already been mentioned, in our account of the Hessian and Brandenburg commotions, in the chapter on the Lutheran church. We here add, that *John Adolphus* duke of Holstein, in the beginning of this century also went over to the side of the Reformed: and much hope was indulged, that his subjects would be led gradually to follow his example; but the prince dying in the year 1616, this hope was frustrated.(1) *Henry* duke of Saxony, in the year 1688 at Dessau, exchanged the Lutheran religion in which he had been educated, for that of the Reformed, at the instigation it is said, of his wife.(2) In the beginning of the century, there were many in Denmark, who secretly leaned towards the doctrines of the Reformed and especially in regard to the doctrine of the Lord's supper, and who had received their instruction from *Nicholas Hemming*, and other friends of *Melancthon*. But this class of persons lost all hope, courage, and influence, after the year 1614, when *John Canute*, a bishop who had too openly avowed his goodwill towards Calvinistic opinions, was deprived of his office.(3) It is well

(1) *Jo. Möller's* Introduct. ad Historiam Chersonesus Cimbricæ, pt. ii., p. 101, &c. *Eric Pontoppidan's* Annales ecclesiæ Danicæ diplomatici, tom. iii., p. 691, &c.

(2) See *George Mœbius*, Selectæ Dispp. Theolog., p. 1137. This prince published a confession of his Faith: which being attacked by the Leipsic divines by public authority, *Isaac de Beausobre*, who was then pastor of the church of Magdeburg, composed a vindication of it: Défense de la doctrine des Reformées et en particulier de la Confession de Foy de S. A. S. Monseigneur le Duc Henry de Saxe, contre un Livre composé par la Faculté de Theologie de Leipsic; Magdeb., 1694, 8vo.

(3) *Pontoppidan's* Annales eccles. Danicæ, tom. iii., p. 695, &c.

known moreover, that the Reformed religion was transplanted by the Dutch and the English, into Africa, Asia, and America; and in various parts of those continents, very flourishing Reformed churches were established: and among the Lutherans also, in one place and another, liberty was granted to the French, German, and English Reformed, freely to set up their worship.

§ 2. Of all the public calamities which diminished the splendour and the prosperity of the Reformed community, the greatest and most lamentable was the subversion of the French church, renowned for so many distinguished men. From the times of *Henry* IV. the Reformed church in France constituted a kind of state or commonwealth within the commonwealth; being fortified by great privileges and rights, and possessing among other things for its security, towns and castles, and especially the very strong fortress of Rochelle; all which places were garrisoned with their own troops. This community was not always under leaders of sufficient foresight and attachment to the crown. Hence sometimes, (for the truth should not be concealed), when civil wars or commotions broke out, this community took the side of those that were opposed to the king, engaged at times in enterprises which the king disliked, too openly sought alliance and friendship with the Dutch and the English, and undertook or aimed at other things, inconsistent, apparently at least, with the public peace and the supreme authority of the king. Hence king *Lewis* XIII. from the year 1621, waged war with the Reformed party; and the prime minister of France, cardinal *Richelieu*, was persuaded that France would never be safe and enjoy peace, until this community was prostrated and deprived of its fortifications, castles, strong towns, and high privileges. *Richelieu*, after various conflicts and numerous efforts, at last obtained his object. For in the year 1628, after a long and difficult siege, he took Rochelle the chief fortress of the Reformed community, and reduced it to subjection to the king: and this city being captured, the Reformed community in France was prostrate; and being deprived of its fortresses, could depend upon nothing but the king's clemency and good pleasure.(4) Those who judge of this transaction by the principles of state policy, deny that it was a violation of all justice and equity; because such communities in the bosom of a kingdom or state, are pernicious and most hazardous to the public peace and safety. And if the French court had stopped here, and had left safe and inviolate to the Reformed their liberties of conscience and religion, purchased with immense blood and great achievements, perhaps the Reformed could and would, have borne the immense loss of their liberties and rights with equanimity.

§ 3. But the French court was not content with this measure of success: having destroyed that species or form of civil polity, which had been annexed to the Reformed church, and which afterwards was deemed adverse to the regal power, the court next attacked the church itself and its religion, contrary to the plighted faith of the kings. At first milder measures were resorted to, promises, caresses, conciliatory expositions of the doc-

(4) See *Jo. le Clerc's* Vie du Cardinal Richelieu, tome i., p. 69, 77, 177, 199, 269. *Mich. le Vassor's* Histoire de Louis XIII., tome iii., p. 676, &c.; tome iv., p. 1, &c., and the subsequent volumes. Add the duke of *Sully*, (a friend to *Henry* IV., himself one of the Reformed, but not disposed to conceal the errors of his church), Memoires, tome iii., iv., v.

trines most offensive to the Reformed, and similar measures, both with the head men of the Reformed community, and with the more learned and eminent of their ministers; and *Richelieu* especially, spared no pains or arts which he thought might have any influence, to draw the Reformed insidiously into the Romish church. But as little or nothing was effected by all these measures, the Catholic bishops especially resorted to sophistry, persecution, the most unrighteous laws, and all the means which either blind passion or ingenious malice could invent, in order gradually to exhaust the people who were so hateful to them, and compel them against their choice, reluctantly to join the standard of the Roman pontiff. Many being overcome by their troubles and their grievous sufferings, yielded; others left the country; but the greatest part firmly persisted in the religion of their fathers.

§ 4. At length, under *Lewis* XIV., after all artifices, snares, and projects had been exhausted in vain, the prelates of the Gallic church and the Jesuits, to whom the king was accustomed to listen, determined that this most resolute body of people must be extirpated by violence and war, and be crushed as it were by a single stroke. Overcome by their arguments and importunate supplications, *Lewis*, in the year 1685, with the approbation and applause of the Roman pontiff, in violation of all laws human and divine, repealed the edict of Nantes, by which his grandfather had granted to the Reformed the liberty of worshipping God according to their own consciences; and commanded his Reformed subjects to return to the religion of their progenitors. The consequence of this most lamentable decree, was, that a vast multitude of French people abandoned their country, to the immense detriment of France,(5) and sought new abiding places in various parts of Europe, in which they might freely serve God: and the others, whom the extreme vigilance of their enemies prevented from acquiring safety by flight, the soldiers compelled by a thousand modes of torture, vexation, and suffering, to profess with their lips, and to exhibit in their outward conduct that Romish religion which they abhorred in their hearts.(6) From this unrighteous act of the (on other occasions magnanimous) king, it may be seen how the Roman pontiffs and their adherents stand affected towards those whom they call *heretics;* and that they regard no treaty, and no oath, too sacred and too solemn to be violated, if the safety or the interests of their church demand it.

(5) See the excellent remarks and observations of *Armand de la Chapelle*, on this subject, in his Life of *Isaac de Beausobre*, subjoined to the posthumous notes of the latter on the New Testament, p. 259, &c. [The edict of Nantes, which gave free toleration to the Protestants, was drawn up and sanctioned by *Henry* IV. in the year 1598; and confirmed by *Lewis* XIII. the year after he assumed the sceptre, A.D. 1613. Its revocation in 1685, was preceded by the despatch of soldiers into all the provinces, to compel the Protestants to abandon their religion. Notwithstanding the great pains taken to prevent their escape from the kingdom, some say half a million, and others say eight hundred thousand Protestants found their way to foreign countries. Nearly forty thousand are said to have passed over to England; whence many of them came to the United States of America. Vast numbers settled in Holland; and large numbers in the Protestant states of Germany, particularly in Prussia, and in Switzerland and Denmark. See *Gifford's* History of France, vol. iv., p. 35, 92, 421, &c. *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, vol. viii., p. 470, &c.—*Tr.*]

(6) No one has illustrated these events more fully than *Elias Benoit*, Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes; a noble work, published at Delft, 1693, &c., in 5 vols. 4to. See also *Voltaire*, Siecle de Louis XIV., tome ii., p. 229.

§ 5. The *Waldenses* inhabiting the valleys of Piedmont, who have been already mentioned as entering into a union with the church of Geneva, were tortured nearly throughout this century, by the very cruel devices and machinations of the instruments of the Roman pontiff; but especially in the years 1655, 1686, and 1696, they were so oppressed and harassed, as to come near to being exterminated.(7) Those who survived these frequent butcheries, owed their precarious and dubious safety to the assiduous intercessions of the Dutch, the English, and the Swiss, with the duke of Savoy. In Germany, the church of the Palatinate, which was once a principal branch of the Reformed community, gradually suffered so much diminution, from the year 1685 when the government passed into the hands of a Catholic prince, that from holding the first rank it was depressed to almost the lowest, among the Reformed churches of Germany.(7)[b]

§ 6. The very great merits of the Reformed in regard to every species of useful knowledge, are so well known to all, that we shall not dwell upon them. We shall also omit the names of the great and distinguished authors, whose works procured permanent fame for themselves, and great advantage to others; because it is difficult, amid so great a number, to select the best.(8) In philosophy, *Aristotle* was the sole guide and lawgiver every where for a long time, just as among the Lutherans; and indeed, *Aristotle*, just as he is portrayed to us by the Scholastic writers. But his authority gradually became very much diminished, from the times of *Gassendi* and *Des Cartes*. For many of the French and Dutch adopted the Cartesian

(7) *Jo. Leger*, Histoire generale des Eglises Vaudoises, pt. ii., ch. vi., p. 72, &c. *Peter Gilles*, Histoire ecclesiastique des Eglises Vaudoises, cap. xlix., p. 353, &c. There is extant a particular history of the calamities sustained by the Waldenses, in the year 1686; printed at Rotterdam, 1688, 12mo. [See also An Account of the late persecutions of the Waldenses by the duke of Savoy and the French king, in 1686; printed, Oxford, 1688, 4to; and *Peter Boyer's* History of the Vaudois, chap. xii.–xxi., p. 72, &c.—*Tr.*]

(7)[b] [See *Struv's* Pfälzische Kirchenhistorie, ch. xiii., § 23–72. The Palatinate, so long as its princes professed the Reformed religion, was to the Reformed churches what Saxony formerly was to the Lutheran, ss., the bond of their external union; and the Palatine church was the most respectable among the German Reformed, as the Saxon church was among the Lutherans. It kept up a constant intercourse with England and Holland. But after the death of the electoral prince *Charles Lewis*, when the electoral dignity passed to the Catholic branch of the family, this church lost a great part of its pre-eminence. On the other hand, the Brandenburg church rose in respectability, as the power of the house of Brandenburg increased; so that at the present day, the church of Brandenburg holds the rank, which was once held by that of the Palatinate.—*Schl.*]

(8) [" The list of the eminent divines and men of learning, that were ornaments to the Reformed church in the seventeenth century, is indeed extremely ample. Among those that adorned *Great Britain*, we shall always remember with peculiar veneration the immortal names of *Newton*, *Barrow*, *Cudworth*, *Boyle*, *Chillingworth*, *Usher*, *Bedell*, *Hall*, *Pocock*, *Fell*, *Lightfoot*, *Hammond*, *Calamy*, *Walton*, *Baxter*, *Pearson*, *Stillingfleet*, *Mede*, *Parker*, *Oughtred*, *Burnet*, *Tillotson*, and many others well known in the literary world. In *Germany* we find *Pareus*, *Scultet*, *Fabricius*, *Alting*, *Pelargus*, and *Bergius*. In *Switzerland* and *Geneva*, *Hospinian*, the two *Buxtorfs*, *Hottinger*, *Heidegger*, and *Turretin*. In the churches and academies of *Holland*, we meet with the following learned divines: *Drusus*, *Amama*, *Gomar*, *Rivet*, *Cloppenburg*, *Vossius*, *Cocceius*, *Voetius*, *Des Marets*, *Heidan*, *Momma*, *Burman*, *Wittichius*, *Hornbeck*, the *Spanheims*, *Le Moyne*, *De Mastricht*; among the *French* doctors, we may reckon *Cameron*, *Chamier*, *Du Moulin*, *Mestrezat*, *Blondel*, *Drelincourt*, *Daillé*, *Amyraut*, the two *Cappels*, *De la Place*, *Gamstole*, *Croy*, *Morus*, *Le Blanc*, *Pajon*, *Bochart*, *Claude*, *Alix*, *Jurieu*, *Basnage*, *Abbadie*, *Beausobre*, *Lenfant*, *Martin*, *Des Vignoles*, &c."—*Mucl.*]

philosophy upon its first appearance, and a large part of the English chose *Gassendi* for their guide and teacher. This was exceedingly offensive to the Aristotelians; who everywhere, but most pugnaciously in Holland, laboured to persuade the people, that immense danger to religion and the truth was to be apprehended from the abandonment of *Aristotle;* nor would they suffer themselves to be ousted from the schools.(9) But the splendour of the increasing light, and the influence of liberty, compelled the pertinacious sect to yield and be silent: so that the Reformed doctors, at the present day, philosophize as freely, as the Lutherans do. Yet I am not sure, that *Aristotle* does not still exercise a secret sway, in the English universities. This at least I could easily evince, that in the times of *Charles* II., *James* II., and *William* III., while the mathematical philosophy prevailed nearly throughout Great Britain, yet at Oxford and Cambridge, the old philosophy was in higher repute with some, than the new discoveries.

§ 7. The expositors of scripture among the Reformed, who adorned the commencement of the century, all trod in the steps of *Calvin;* and according to his example, they did not search after recondite meanings and types, but investigated solely the import of the words of the sacred writers. But this uniformity, in process of time was done away, by the influence of two very distinguished interpreters, *Hugo Grotius* and *John Cocceius*. The former, departing but slightly from *Calvin's* manner, investigates only the literal sense in the books of both the Old Testament and the New; considers the predictions of the ancient prophets, as being all fulfilled in events anterior to the coming of Christ, and therefore in the letter of them, as not to be applied to Christ: yet he supposes, that in some of those prophecies, especially in such as the writers of the New Testament apply to Christ, there is, besides the literal sense, a secret or *mystical* sense concealed under the persons, events, and things described, which relates to Christ, to his history and mediation. Very different were the principles of *Cocceius*. He supposed, that the whole Old Testament history exhibited as in a kind of mirror, the history of *Christ* and of the Christian church; and that the prophecies of the ancient prophets, in their literal import, treated of *Jesus Christ;* and that whatever was to occur in the Christian church down to the end of time, was all prefigured in the Old Testament, in some places more clearly, and in others less so.(10) Each of these men had a multitude of followers and disciples. With the former were, besides the Arminians, those adherents to the old Calvinistic system, who from *Gisbert Voet* the principal antagonist of *Cocceius*, were called *Voetians;* also many of the English, and a great number of the French. The latter was highly admired by not a few of the Dutch, the Swiss, and the Germans. Yet there are many, who stand intermediate between these two classes of interpreters; agreeing with neither throughout, but with each in part. Moreover, neither the *Grotian* interpreters nor the *Cocceian*, are all of the same description; but each class is subdivided into various subordinate classes. No small portion of the English *Episcopalians*, despising these modern guides, think the first doctors of the nascent church

(9) See *Andrew Baillet*, Vie de Mr. de Cartes; in numerous passages.

(10) It is commonly said: *Cocceius finds Christ every where, but Grotius no where, in the pages of the Old Testament.* The first part of the adage is most true: the last is not so true. For *Grotius*, as his commentaries fully show, does find *Christ* in many passages of the Old Testament; though in a different way from *Cocceius*, that is, not in the *words*, but in the things and the persons.

ought to be consulted, and that the sacred books should be expounded, just as the *Fathers* expounded them.(11)

§ 8. The doctrines of Christianity were disfigured among the Reformed, just as among the Lutherans, by the Peripatetic or rather the Scholastic paint. The entire subjugation of these doctrines to the empire of Aristotle, and their reduction to the form of a Peripatetic science, was first resisted by the Arminians; who followed a more simple mode of teaching, and inveighed loudly against such divines as subjected the doctrines relating to man's salvation to the artificial distinctions and phraseology of the schools. Next followed the Cartesians and the Coccceians; the former of whom applied the principles of their philosophy to the explication of revealed truth; while the latter supposed, that the whole system of theology would appear to the best advantage, if dressed up in the form and garb of a divine *covenant* with men. But grave and wise men among the Reformed, were pleased with neither of these. For they objected, that the sacred doctrines would be rendered equally obscure and intricate, by the Cartesian distinctions and peculiar conceptions, as by the Peripatetic phraseology and distinctions: and the application of the analogy of a covenant to the whole of theology, was productive of this evil among others which no good man can approve, that it causes the phraseology and the subtle distinctions of the forum to be transferred to the schools of theology, and to produce there vain and futile disputes about things the most sacred. Most of the English and the French would not consent to be thus trammelled, but treated both doctrinal and practical theology, freely, after the manner of the Arminians.

§ 9. As already observed in another place, *William Ames*, an Englishman, was the first among the Reformed who attempted to elucidate and arrange the science of morals, as distinct from that of dogmatics.(12) But he is dry, and writes more for the schools than for common life. Afterwards the Arminians, (who it appears, were much more zealous to perfect that part of theology which regulates the life and the heart, than that which informs the understanding), induced great numbers, to attempt something more useful and more popular in this department. The French however and the English, excel the others in facility, acuteness, and solidity. Among the French, to mention no others, *Moses Amyraut*, a man of distinguished energy and acuteness of mind, first produced in French though in a style now obsolete, a complete system of moral science; from which, those who have more recently obtained much reputation by their writings, *John la Placette*, and *Benedict Pictet*, appear to have profited not a little.(13) Among the English, during the immense convulsions of the civil wars, the

(11) These are expressly refuted by the learned *Daniel Whitby*, in his Dissertatio de Scripturarum interpretatione secundum Patrum commentarios, London, 1714, 8vo. [*Whitby* has here collected the absurd and whimsical expositions of the fathers, and placed them together in their most ridiculous attitude. See *Maclaine's* note.—*Tr.*]

(12) [In his book de Conscientia et ejus jure vel casibus, libri v., Amsterd., 1630, 4to, 1640, and 1670, 12mo. It was also published in a German translation, by *Geo. Phil. Harsdörfer*, Nuremb., 1654.—*Schl.* See above, note (81), p. 194.—*Tr.*]

(13) [*Amyraut's* work, entitled Morale Chrêtienne, was printed in 1652, 6 vols. 8vo. —*La Placette's* work was entitled: Essais de Morale avec la suite, Hague, 1706, 8 volumes 12mo, and was published in a German translation, Jena, 1719 and 1728.—*Pictet's* work was entitled: La Morale Chrêtienne, ou l'Art de bien vivre, Geneva, 1710, 2 vols. 4to. This work was so satisfactory to the Catholics, that the countess of Sporck had it translated into German, omitting the passages offensive to the Catholics, and printed it at her own cost, Prague, 1711.—*Schl.*]

Presbyterians especially and the *Independents*, endeavoured by various works to subserve the cause of piety. Some of these, (as the nation is naturally grave and inclined towards austerity), are too rigorous and regardless of man's condition; while others manifestly incline towards the precepts of the Mystics. When *Hobbes* subjected all religion to the sovereign will of princes, and laboured to subvert altogether the natural distinction between right and wrong, he roused up great and discerning men, *Cumberland*, *Sharroch*, *Cudworth*, and others,(14) to lay open the primary sources of right and justice, and to purify them from misrepresentations; by which they contributed very much to the illustration and confirmation of Christian holiness.

§ 10. At the beginning of the century, the school at Geneva was in such reputation throughout the Reformed world, that nearly all resorted to it who were not prevented by the narrowness of their worldly circumstances, from aspiring after the best education and the highest attainments in theological knowledge.(15) Hence the opinions of *Calvin* and his pupils, respecting the divine decrees and grace, readily spread every where, and were introduced into all the schools. Yet there was no where any public ordinance or test, which compelled the religious teachers not to believe or to teach differently from the Genevans.(16) Of course there were many persons living here and there, who either disagreed altogether with the Genevans,(17) or qualified in some measure their doctrine. And even those who took the side of the Genevans, had some dissension among themselves. For while most of them supposed, that God only *permitted* the first man to sin, but did not *decree* his apostacy; others went farther, and were so daring as to maintain, that God from all eternity, in order to place his justice and his free goodness in the clearest light, had decreed the lamentable transgression of Adam; and had so disposed every thing, that our first parents could not avoid or escape the transgression. The latter were called *Supralapsarians*, in distinction from the former, who were called *Infralapsarians*.

§ 11. Disregarding the points in which they differed, as being of small

(14) ["See *Leland's* View of Deistical Writers, vol. i., p. 48."—*Macl.*]

(15) The high reputation which the Genevan academy once had, gradually declined, after the establishment of the Dutch republic, and the erection of the universities of Leyden, Franeker, and Utrecht.

(16) Besides *Hugo Grotius*, who evinces this in his Apologeticum, already mentioned, see *Theodore Volckh. Coornhart*, a Hollander, well known by the controversies he produced, in his Dutch tracts written near the close of the [preceding] century, in which he assails the doctrine of absolute decrees. I have now before me, his: Dolinghen des Catechismi ende der Predicanten, Utrecht, 1590, 8vo. Van de tolatinghe ende decrete Godes Bedenkinghe, of de heylighe Schrift als Johan Calvin ende Beza dærvan leeren, Altena, 1572, 8vo. Orsacken ende middelen van der Menschen saligheid ende Verdœmenisse, 1603, 8vo. Of this man, *Godfr. Arnold* treats, in the second vol. of his Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, in several places. [Especially, pt. iii., ch. vi., vol. ii., p. 377, &c., ed. 1741, where his life and controversies are stated at length.—*Tr. James Arminius*, while a minister at Amsterdam, being directed by the Consistory to refute the writings of *Coornhart*, was converted to his doctrines, by the perusal of his writings, and therefore defended them against the Reformed.—*Schl.*]

(17) [E. gr., *Henry Bullinger*, a famous divine at Zurich, who clearly declared in favour of universal grace. See *Jo. Alphon. Turretin's* Letter to W. Wake, archbishop of Canterbury, in the Bibliotheque Germanique, tome xiii., art. ii., p. 92, &c., and *Herm. Hildebrand's* Orthodoxa Declaratio articulorum trium, p. 295, &c.; and even in Holland, at the establishment of the university of Leyden, *John Holmann*, a universalist, was appointed first professor of theology. See *Gerhard Brandt's* History of the Reformation in the Netherlands, book ix., and the Histoire abregée de la Reformation de Brandt, tome i., p. 229, &c.—*Schl.*]

moment, both laboured with united strength to put down those who maintained, that God is most graciously disposed towards all mankind. Hence a great schism arose, soon after the commencement of the century, which never could be healed. *James Arminius*, professor of theology at Leyden, rejected the Genevan views, and embraced the Lutheran doctrine concerning grace, which excludes no one absolutely from eternal salvation. He was joined by many persons in Holland, who were distinguished both for learning and the stations they filled. On the other hand, he was most strenuously opposed by *Francis Gomarus*, his colleague, and by the principal teachers in the universities. The rulers of the commonwealth recommended moderation, and supposed that both opinions might be taught in a free state without injury to religion. After long altercation and violent contests, by order of *Maurice* prince of Orange,(18) this controversy was submitted to the judgment of the whole church, and was discussed in a council held at Dort in 1618. There were present in the council, besides the best theologians of Holland, representatives of the English, the Palatines, the Swiss, the Bremensians, and the Hessians. Before this tribunal the Arminians lost their cause, and were pronounced corruptors of the true religion: and those among the Genevans who are called *Infralapsarians*, triumphed. The *Supralapsarian* party indeed had supporters and advocates, who were neither few nor inactive; but the moderation and gentleness especially of the English divines, prevented their doctrines from obtaining the sanction of the Synod. The *Infralapsarians* also would not have obtained all they wished for, [against the Arminians], if things could have gone according to the wishes of the Bremensian divines; who for weighty reasons, did not choose to be at variance with the Lutherans.(19)

§ 12. Whether this victory over the Arminians, on the whole, was advantageous, or detrimental to the doctrinal views of the Genevans, and to the Reformed church, may be justly questioned. This is most certain, that after the times of the council of Dort, the doctrine of absolute decrees began to decline, and to sink more and more; and stern necessity obliged its defenders to recognise as brethren, those who either openly coincided with the Arminians, or at least bore a near resemblance to them. The Arminians, who were at first condemned, and whose leaders were men of great eloquence and of superior genius as well as learning, being irritated by banishments, legal penalties, and various other injuries, attacked their foes with so much vigour and eloquence, that vast numbers became persuaded of the justice of their cause. Among the Dutch themselves, the provinces of Friesland, Zealand, Utrecht, Groningen, and Guelderland, could not be persuaded to receive the decrees of the synod of Dort. And though, after the lapse of many years in 1651, these provinces were at length prevailed upon to declare their pleasure, that the Reformed religion, as it was settled at Dort, should be maintained and defended; yet the greatest jurists among the Dutch maintain, that this decision cannot have the force of a real and absolute law.(20) England, through the influence especially of *Wil-*

(18) ["It was not by the authority of prince *Maurice*, but by that of the States-general, that the national synod was assembled at Dort. The States were not indeed unanimous; three of the seven provinces protested against the holding of the synod, viz., *Holland*, *Utrecht*, and *Overyssel*."—*Macl.*]

(19) The writers on these transactions, will be mentioned below, in the chapter on the *Arminian* church.

(20) See the illustrious *Conrad von Bynck-*

liam Laud, went over to the side of the Arminians, immediately after the synod of Dort; and quite to our times, it has not so much neglected, as actually despised and contemned the decisions of that council.(21) And this was almost a necessary occurrence, since the English wished to conform their church to the institutions, opinions, and rules of the first centuries; and the *Fathers*, as they are called, before *Augustine*, assigned no limitation to the grace and good-will of God. The French, although at first they seemed to favour the decisions at Dort, yet soon afterwards, because those decisions were very offensive to the papists among whom they lived, began to think and to teach very diversely from them. Among the Germans, neither the churches of Brandenburg nor those of Bremen would suffer their teachers to be tied down to the opinions of the Dutch. Hence the liberty of free thought respecting grace and predestination, which seemed to be wholly extinguished and suppressed at Dort, rather acquired life and activity from the transactions there; and the Reformed church soon became divided into *Universalists* and *Semi-Universalists*, *Supralapsarians* and *Infralapsarians*;(22) who, though they dislike each other, and sometimes get into contention, yet are prevented by various causes, from attacking and overpowering one another by open war. What is very noticeable, we have in our own times seen Geneva itself, the parent, nurse, and guardian of the doctrine of *absolute decrees and particular grace*, not only become kind and gentle towards the Arminians, but also herself almost an Arminian.

§ 13. The Gallic church while it remained inviolate, thought proper to deviate in many particulars, from the common rule of the Reformed; and this, as appears from many proofs, principally from this one cause, that it might in some measure be relieved from a part of the hatred under which it laboured, and from that load of odious consequences which the papists charged upon the Genevan doctrines. Hence the books of the theologians of Sedan and Saumur, which were composed after the synod of Dort, contain many things quite similar and kindred not only to the Lu-

ershœck's Quæstionum Juris publici Libri duo, Leyden 1737, 4to, lib ii., cap. xviii.

(21) *Sever. Lintrup's* Dissert. de contemptu concilii Dordracenæ in Anglia; in the Diss. Theologicæ of *Hect. Godfr. Masius*, tom. i., No. 19. [See king *James'* Injunctions to the bishops, A.D. 1622, in *Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. ii., ch. ii., p. 153.—*Tr.*]

(22) [*Universalists* are those among the Reformed, who teach the universal grace of God towards all apostate men; and consequently, also, a universal atonement, and a call to all men. They are however, divided into two classes. Some ascribe to the means of grace which God affords, sufficient power to enlighten and sanctify all men; and teach, that it depends on the voluntary conduct of men, whether the grace of God shall produce its effects on them or not. These, who are sometimes called absolute (unconditional) Universalists, are by *Dr. Mosheim* denominated simply *Universalists*. Others maintain, that God indeed wishes to make all men happy, but only on the condition of their believing; and that this faith originates from the sovereign and irresistible operation of God, or from the free, unconditional, and sovereign election of God. These, who are sometimes called hypothetical (conditional) Universalists, and who scarcely differ, except in words, from the Infralapsarians, are by *Dr. Mosheim* denominated *Semi-Universalists*. The *Supralapsarians*, to which class belonged *Beza*, *Francis Gomarus*, and *Gisbert Voetius*, not only teach unconditional election, but they place this election *anterior* to the purpose of God to create men, and their apostacy. The *Infralapsarians*, on the contrary, make this unconditional election to be *subsequent* to the foreseen apostacy. Both these last, are also called, [in distinction from the *Universalists*], *Particularists*. But it is to be hoped, that when sound interpretation shall become prevalent in the Reformed churches, these parties, which are the unhappy offspring of a disputatious spirit and of ignorance of the original languages, will at length entirely cease.—*Schl.*]

theran sentiments concerning grace, predestination, the person of Christ, and the efficacy of the sacraments, but also to some opinions of the Romanists. The commencement of this moderation may be traced back, I think, to the year 1615, when the opinion of *John Piscator*, a divine of Herborn, respecting the obedience of Christ, was tacitly received or at least pronounced void of error,(23) in the council of the Isle of France, notwithstanding it had before been rejected and exploded in other French councils.(24) *Piscator* supposed, that our Saviour did not satisfy the divine law in our stead, by his *obedience;* but that he as a man, was bound to obey the divine will, and therefore could not merit any thing with God for others by keeping the law. It will be easy for those who understand the papal doctrines, to see how much aid this opinion affords to the papists, in confirming the sentiments they commonly inculcate respecting the merit of good works, the power of man to obey the law, and other points.(25) This small beginning was followed by other far more important steps; among which, some were so devious, that the most modest, and the most averse from contention, among the French themselves, could not approve them.(26)

§ 14. Two divines of Saumur, first *John Camero*, and afterwards *Moses Amyraut*, a man distinguished for perspicacity and erudition, devised a method of reconciling the doctrine of the Genevans respecting the divine decrees as expounded at Dort, with the views of those who hold that the love of God embraces the whole human race. And *Amyraut* from about the

(23) *Jo. Aymon*, Actes de tous les Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées de France, tome ii., p. 275, 276.

(24) See *Aymon*, loc. cit., tome i., p. 301, 400, 457, tome ii., p. 13. *Jac. Benign. Bossuet*, Histoire des variations des Eglises Protestantes, livr. xii., tome ii., p. 268. To *Bossuet* thus tauntingly reproaching, as is his custom, the changeableness of the Reformed, *Jac. Basnage* appears to have replied, not solidly, in his Histoire de l'Eglise, tome ii., p. 1533, &c. [There manifestly was some change in the views of the French divines, in regard to *Piscator's* sentiments; for they repeatedly and expressly condemned them, in several of their synods, and afterwards yielded up the point. Hence *Basnage* could not deny the fact. But was this change of opinion any way reproachful to the French clergy? *Bossuet* thought it was: but candid men will perhaps judge otherwise.—*Tr.*]

(25) [*Dr. Maclaine* is much offended with *Dr. Mosheim*, for intimating that *Piscator's* opinions afforded support to the popish doctrines of the merit of good works, man's ability to obey the law, &c. And indeed, it would be difficult to maintain the connexion, supposed by Dr. Mosheim. It is also true, as Dr. *Maclaine* states, that *Piscator's* doctrine by denying that even *Christ* himself could perform any works of supererogation, cut up by the roots the popish doctrine, that a vast number of common saints have performed such works, and thus have filled that spiritual treasury, from which the pontiffs can dispense pardons and indulgences to an almost unlimited extent.—*Piscator* held that *Christ* redeemed us, only by his *death*, or by his *sufferings;* and not as was then generally held, by both his *active* and his *passive* obedience. His arguments were, that *Christ*, as being a man, was bound to obey the will of God perfectly; so that he could not *do* more, than he was under personal obligation to perform. Moreover, that if Christ had perfectly *obeyed* the law *in man's stead;* then men would not be under obligation to obey it themselves: because it would be unjust in God to require obedience *twice over*, once from our representative, and then again from us. Besides, if Christ, in our stead, both obeyed the law, and suffered the penalty of its violation; then the law had been *doubly satisfied;* or God had received the obedience he required, and yet inflicted the penalty for disobedience.—*Tr.*]

(26) [*Dr. Maclaine* is here out of all patience with *Mosheim;* and taxes him with bringing a *groundless* and *malignant* charge against the whole body of the French Reformed church. But *Maclaine* appears excited, beyond what the occasion required. The five following paragraphs, namely, § 14–18, detail the facts, in view of which, *Mosheim* made the assertion contained in the close of this paragraph. Let the reader carefully peruse them, and then judge how far *Mosheim* deserves rebuke.—*Tr.*]

year 1634, pursued this most difficult of all objects with so much zeal, and with so great vigour of genius, that to gain his point he changed a great part of the received system of theology. His plan, which was too extensive to be here fully detailed, was substantially this: that God wishes the salvation of all men whatever; and that no mortal is excluded from the benefits of *Christ*, by any divine decree: but that no one can become a partaker, either of the benefits of *Christ*, or of salvation, unless he believes in *Christ*. And that God in his boundless goodness, has withheld from no one the power or ability to believe: but he by no means assists all, so to use this power as to obtain salvation. Hence it is, that so many thousands of men perish, through their own fault, and not by the fault of God.(27) Those who embraced this scheme, were called *Hypothetical Universalists;* because they believed, that God is disposed indeed to show mercy to all, yet only on the condition that they believe in *Christ*. It is the opinion of many, that this doctrine does not differ from that maintained at Dort, except as *Hercules'* naked club differed from the same when painted and adorned with ribands, that is, but slightly. But I doubt, whether such persons have duly considered both the principles from which it is derived, and the consequences to which it leads. After considering and reconsidering it, it appears to me to be *Arminianism*, or if you please, *Pelagianism*, artificially dressed up, and veiled in ambiguous terms: and in this opinion I feel myself greatly confirmed, when I look at the more recent disciples of *Amyraut*, who express their views more clearly and more boldly than their master.(28) The author of this doctrine was first attacked by some councils of the French [Protestants]; but when they had examined the cause, they acquitted and dismissed him.(29) With greater violence, he was assailed by the celebrated Dutch divines, *Andrew Rivet*, *Frederic Spanheim*, *Samuel des Marets* (*Maresius*), and others: to whom, *Amyraut* himself, and afterwards the leading French divines, *John Daillé* (*Dallæus*), *David Blondell*, and others, made energic replies.(30) The vehement and long-protracted contest was productive of very little effect. For the opinions of *Amyraut* infected not only the Huguenot universities in France and nearly all the principal doctors, but also spread first to Geneva, and then with the French exiles, through all the Reformed churches. Nor is there any one at the present day, who ventures to speak against it.

§ 15. From the same desire of softening certain Reformed doctrines, which afforded to the papists as well as to others much occasion for reproach, originated *Joshua Placæus'* (de la Placé's) opinion concerning the *imputation* of the sin committed by the parents of the human race. This theologian of Saumur, the colleague and intimate friend of *Amyraut*, in the

(27) See *Jo. Wolfg. Jaeger's* Historia eccles. et politica sæculi xvii., decenn. iv., p. 522, &c.

(28) [*Schlegel* expresses much regret, that *Dr. Mosheim* neither here, nor in his lectures, more clearly showed, how a disguised Pelagianism lies concealed under this scheme of the Hypothetical Universalists. And he refers us to his notes on vol. i., cent. v., pt. ii., chap. v., § 23 and 26, to show that this scheme of *Amyraut*, was not in reality Pelagianism, nor even Semipelagianism.—*Tr.*]

(29) See *Aymon's* Actes des Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées en France, tome ii., p. 571, &c., p. 604, &c. [*Quick's* Synodicon, vol. ii., p. 352, &c., 397, &c., 455.—*Tr.*] *David Blondell's* Actes authentiques des Eglises Reformées touchant la paix et la charité fraternelle, p. 19, &c., p. 82, Amsterd., 1655, 4to.

(30) *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire, tome i., art. *Amyraut*, p. 182; Art. *Daillé*, tome ii., p. 947, &c; Art. *Blondell*, tome i., p. 571, &c. *Christ. Matth. Pfaff*, de Formula Consensus, cap. i., p. 4, &c., and others.

year 1640, denied the doctrine then generally inculcated in the Reformed schools, that the sin of the first man was *imputed* to his posterity; and maintained on the contrary, that each person's own inherent defilement and disposition to sin, is attributed to him, by God, as his crime; or, to use the language of theologians, he contended that *original sin* is imputed to men, *not immediately, but only mediately*. This opinion was condemned as erroneous in the Synod of Charenton A.D. 1642, and was confuted by many theologians of great respectability among the Swiss and the Dutch.(31) And *De la Placé* influenced by the love of peace, did not think proper to offer any public defence of it.(32) But neither his silence, nor the condemnation of the synod, could prevent this doctrine from commending itself to the minds of very many of the French as being reasonable; or from spreading, through them, into other countries.—In the number of those who were disposed to gratify the papists at the expense of the religion of their fathers, many have placed *Lewis Cappel*, another divine of Saumur; who in a long and elaborate work,(33) attempted to prove that the Hebrew vowel points were not inserted by the inspired writers, but were added in more recent times. This indeed is certain, that his opinion pleased the Romanists, who thought it very useful to weaken the authority of the sacred scriptures and depress them below the unwritten word [or tradition]. It was therefore the more earnestly and learnedly opposed, by great numbers of the best Hebricians, both among the Lutherans and the Reformed.(34)

§ 16. All these divines, though they incurred much odium, yet obtained the approbation of very many, and have been pronouced uncensurable by the candour of subsequent times: but those were less fortunate, who have been already mentioned as openly meditating a union of the French Re-

(31) *Aymon*, Synodes des Eglises Reformées de France, tome ii., p. 680. [*Quick's* Synodicon, vol. ii., p. 473. He maintained *hereditary depravity*, which he accounted criminal, and a just ground of punishment; but denied the *imputation of Adam's sin* to his posterity.—*Tr.* *Placæus* advanced his opinion, in his Theses theologicæ de statu hominis lapsi ante gratiam, 1640; which are inserted in the Syntagma Thesium theologicar. in Academia Salmuriensi disputatarum, pt. i., p 205, &c. He was understood by some, to deny all imputation of Adam's sin: and was first brought into trouble on the subject, in the year 1645; when *Ant. Garissol*, a divine of Montauban, and others, accused him before the national synod at Charenton. *Amyraut*, though he adhered to the common doctrine, defended him: but his opinion was disapproved by the synod. Many censured the decision of the synod, as being hasty and unjust; because *Placæus* was condemned, uncited and unheard, his opinion being misapprehended, and *Garissol* his accuser, being allowed to preside in the synod. *Placæus* himself was so cool, dispassionate, and peaceful, that he defended his assailed reputation by no public writing, but patiently waited for the meeting of a new synod; until, at last, the unceasing outcry of his opposers, in 1655, compelled him to publish a new Disputation, de imputatione primi peccati Adami; in which he showed, that the synod did not understand his doctrine; since he denied merely the *immediate* imputation of Adam's sin, (an imputation arising from the sovereign decree of God), and not the *mediate* imputation or one naturally consequent on the descent of men from Adam. Yet this explanation did not satisfy his excited opposers. *Andrew Rivet*, *Samuel Maresius*, and *Francis Turretin* did not cease to assail him; and by instigation of the last named, the belief of immediate imputation was settled as an article of faith, by the church of Geneva, in the year 1675. See *Weismann's* Historia Eccles. sæc. xvii., p. 919.—*Schl.*]

(32) See *Christ. Eberh. Weismann's* Hist. Eccles. sæc. xvii., p. 817.

(33) In his Arcanum Punctationis revelatum; which with his Vindiciæ, may be found in his Works. Amsterd., 1689, fol., and in the Critica Sacra Vet. Test., Paris, 1650, fol.

(34) See *Jo. Christ. Wolf's* Bibliotheca Hebraica, pt. ii., p. 27, &c.

formed church with that subject to Romish sway; and likewise those, who attempted so to explain or shape theology, as to render a transition to the Romish party shorter and more easy. To this class belonged *Lewis le Blanc* a divine of Sedan, and *Claude Pajon* a minister at Orleans; both of whom were eloquent and men of great penetration. The former, with great perspicuity, so treated various controversies which divide the Protestants from the papists, as to show that some of them were mere contests about words, and that others were of much less importance than was commonly supposed.(35) Hence he is much censured to this day, by all those who think great care should be taken, lest by filing down and lessening too much the causes of disagreement, the truth should be exposed to danger.(36) This acute man left behind him a sect; which, however, being very odious to most persons, either conceals or very cautiously states its real sentiments.

§ 17. *Claude Pajon* appeared to explain and to adulterate that part of the Reformed religion, which treats of the native depravity of man, his power to do good, the grace of God, and the conversion of the soul to God,—by the principles and tenets of the Cartesian philosophy, which he had imbibed completely. But what his opinions really were, it is very difficult to determine: and whether this arises from his intentional concealment of his real sentiments by the use of ambiguous phraseology, or from the negligence or the malice of his adversaries, I cannot readily decide. If we believe his adversaries, he supposed that man has more soundness and more ability to reform himself, than is generally apprehended; that what is called *original sin* cleaves only to the understanding, and consists principally in the obscurity and defectiveness of man's views of religious subjects; that this depravity of the human understanding excites the will to evil inclinations and actions; that it is to be cured, not by the powers of nature, but by the influences of the Holy Spirit acting through the medium of the divine word: that this word however, does not possess any inherent divine power, or any *physical* or *hyperphysical* energy, but only a *moral* influence; that is, it reforms the human understanding in the same manner as human truth does, namely, by exhibiting clear and correct views of religious subjects, and solid arguments which evince the agreement of the truths of Christianity with correct reason and their divinity; and therefore that every man, if his power were not weakened and prostrated by either internal or external impediments, might renew his own mind by the use of his reason and by meditation on revealed truth, without the extraordinary aid of the Holy Spirit.(37) But *Pajon* himself asserts, that he believed and professed, all that is contained in the decisions of Dort

(35) In his Theses Theologicæ; which are well worth reading. The copy before me was printed at London, 1675, fol., but there have been a number of editions of them.

(36) See *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire, tome i., article *Beaulieu*, p. 458, &c. [His whole name was *Lewis le Blanc, Sieur de Beaulieu*. See the notice of him, above, in note (29), p. 294.—*Tr.*]

(37) See *Fred. Spanheim*, Append. ad Elenchum controversiarum; Opp., tom. iii., p. 882, &c. *Peter Jurieu*, Traité de la nature et de la grace, p. 35, &c. *Val. Ern. Læscher*, Exercit. de Claud. Paionii ejusque sectator. doctrina et fatis, Lips., 1692, 12mo. [*Spanheim* was a more candid adversary of *Pajon*, than *Jurieu*. *Weismann* (Hist. Eccles., sæcul. xvii., p. 942) follows *Jurieu* for the most part, and is too severe upon *Pajon*; who had no other aim than to guard against fanaticism and enthusiasm, and probably viewed the word of God with higher reverence than many of his opposers did.—*Schl.*]

and in the other confessions and catechisms of the Reformed. He complains that his opinions were misunderstood; and states, that he does not deny all *immediate operation of the Holy Spirit* on the minds of those who are converted to God, but only such an immediate operation as is unconnected with the word of God; in other words, that he cannot agree with those, who think that the word of God is only an external and *inoperative sign* of an immediate divine operation.(38) This last proposition is manifestly ambiguous and captious. He finally adds, that we ought not to contend about the *manner* in which the Holy Spirit operates on the minds of men; that it is sufficient if a person holds this one point, that the Holy Spirit is the author of all that is good in us. The sentiments of *Pajon* however, were condemned, not only by the principal Reformed divines, but also by some synods of the French church in 1677, and by a Dutch synod at Rotterdam in 1686.

§ 18. This controversy, which was in a measure settled and ended by the death of *Pajon*, was propagated in many books and discourses throughout England, Holland, and Germany, by *Isaac Papin*, a Frenchman of Blois, and sister's son to *Pajon*. Throwing off all disguise, he ventured to express himself much more coarsely and harshly than his uncle. He declared, that the opinion of his uncle was this: *That man has even more power, than is necessary to enable him to understand divine truth: that for the reformation and regeneration of the soul, nothing more is required, than to remove an unsound state of the body by medical aid, if such a state happens to exist, and then, to place before the understanding truth and error, and before the will virtue and vice, clearly and distinctly, with their appropriate arguments.* This and the other opinions of *Papin*, *Peter Jurieu*, among others, a celebrated divine of Rotterdam, confuted with uncommon warmth, in the years 1686, 1687, and 1688. They were also condemned by the synod of Bois-le-Duc in 1687; and still more severely, by the synod at the Hague in 1688, which also ejected the man from the Reformed church. Provoked by this severity, *Papin*, who in other things manifested fine talents, returned to France in the year 1689, and the next year revolted to the Romish church; in which he died, in the year 1709.(39) Some think he was treated unjustly, and that his opinions were misrepresented, by his mortal adversary, *Jurieu;* but how true this may be, I cannot say. A defence of the Paionian sentiment was likewise attempted in 1684, in several tracts, by *Charles le Cene;* a French divine of a vigorous mind, who has given us a French translation of the Bible.(40) But as he entirely discarded and denied the natural depravity of man; and taught, that we can regenerate ourselves by our own power, by attentively listening to divine truth, especially if we enjoy also the advantages of a good education, good

(38) See the tract which *Pajon* himself composed, and which is inserted in *Jac. Geo. de Chaufepied's* Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. et Critique, tome ii., art. Cene, p. 164, &c.

(39) See *Jurieu*, de la nature et de la grace; and in other writings. *Jo. Möller*, Cimbria Litterata, tom. ii, p. 608, &c., and others. [According to *Möller*, loc. cit., *Papin's* scheme of doctrine, grew out of his Cartesian philosophy. He supposed, that in creating the world, God so formed and constituted all things, that he never has occasion to interpose his immediate agency, unless when a miracle is necessary. Of course, that the conversion of sinners is brought about, as all other events are, by the operation of natural causes.—*Tr.*]

(40) This version was published after the author's death, Amsterd., 1741, fol., and was condemned by the Dutch synods.

examples, &c., hence some contend, that his scheme of doctrine differs in many respects, from that of *Pajon*.(41)

§ 19. The English church was agitated with most violent storms and tempests. When *James* I. king of Scotland, on the death of *Elizabeth*, ascended the throne of England, the *Puritans* or friends of the Genevan discipline, indulged no little hope that their condition would be meliorated, and that they should no longer be exposed to the continual wrongs of the *Episcopalians*. For the king had been born and educated among the Scotch, who were *Puritans*.(42) And his first movements corresponded well with these expectations, and seemed to announce that the king would assume the character of mediator between the dissenting parties.(43) But on a sudden, every thing assumed a different aspect. King *James*, who was eager to grasp supreme and unlimited power, at once judged that the *Presbyterian* form of church government was adverse to his designs, and

(41) See the Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. et Critique, article *Cene*, tome ii., p. 160, &c.

(42) ["And had, on some occasions, made the strongest declaration of his attachment to their ecclesiastical constitution."—"In a general assembly held at Edinburgh, in the year 1590, this prince is said to have made the following declaration: 'I praise God that I was born in the time of the light of the gospel, and in such a place, as to be king of the sincerest (i. e., purest) kirk in the world. The kirk of Geneva keep pasche and yule (i. e., *Easter* and *Christmas*). What have they for them? They have no institution. As for our neighbour kirk of England, their service is an evil-said mass in English; they want nothing of the mass, but the liftings (i. e., *the elevation of the host*). I charge you, my good ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort your people to do the same; and I forsooth, as long as I brook my life, shall do the same.' *Calderwood's* History of the Church of Scotland, p. 256."—*Macl.*]

(43) [King *James* professed himself attached to the church of Scotland, until his removal to England, in April, 1603. While on his journey, all religious parties in England made their court to him. To the Dutch and French Protestants settled in the country, he gave favourable answers. The bishops negotiated with him by their envoys. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge addressed him in behalf of the establishment; and the Puritans presented their petition in favour of a reform of the church. One petition of the latter, signed by about 800 Puritan ministers, was called the *Millenary Petition*, from the almost a *thousand* signatures to it. In October, 1603, the king appointed a conference at Hampton Court, to be held the January following, between the Episcopalians and the Puritans, with a view to settle the controversies. On the side of the Episcopalians, were nine bishops and about as many dignitaries of the church; and on the part of the Puritans, were four English divines and one from Scotland; all of whom were selected by the king himself. On the first day of the conference, Jan. 14, 1604, the Episcopalians alone were admitted to the royal presence: and the king made some few objections to the English ritual and discipline, which the bishops either vindicated or consented to modify. The second day, Jan. 16th, the Puritans were admitted; and proceeded to state their wishes. But the king treated them harshly, and allowed the Episcopalians to browbeat them. The bishops had a complete triumph: and *Bancroft*, falling on his knees, said: "I protest, my heart melteth for joy, that Almighty God, of his singular mercy, has given us such a king, as since Christ's time has not been." On the third day, Jan. 18th, the bishops and deans were first called in, to settle with the king what alterations should be made in the regulations of the church. Archbishop *Whitgift* was so elated to hear the king's approval of the law for the oath *ex officio*, that he exclaimed: "Undoubtedly, your majesty speaks by the special assistance of God's spirit." After this, the Puritans were called in, not to discuss the points in controversy, but merely to hear what had been agreed upon by the king and the bishops. Thus ended this mock conference; in which the king showed himself exceedingly vain, and insolent towards the Puritans, and wholly on the side of the Episcopalians. The next month, a proclamation was issued, giving an acount of the conference, and requiring conformity to the liturgy and ceremonies. See *Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. ii., ch. i., p. 30, &c., and the authors there referred to: also *Johnson Grant's* History of the English Church and the Sects, &c., vol. ii., ch. ix., p. 52, &c.—*Tr.*]

the *Episcopal* favourable to them; because *Presbyterian* churches form a kind of republic, which is subject to a number of leading men all possessing equal rank and power; while *Episcopal* churches more nearly resemble a monarchy. The very name of a *republic*, *synod*, or *council*, was odious to the king; and he therefore studied most earnestly to increase the power of the bishops; and publicly declared, that without bishops the throne could not be safe.(44) At the same time, he long wished to preserve inviolate the Genevan doctrines, especially those relating to divine grace and predestination; and he allowed the opposite doctrines of *Arminius*, to be condemned by his theologians at the synod of Dort. This disposition of the king was studiously cherished, so long as he had power, by *George Abbot* archbishop of Canterbury, a man of great weight of character, who was himself devoted to Calvinistic sentiments, and was a great friend to English liberty, and whose gentleness towards their fathers, the modern Puritans highly extol.(45) But the English envoys had scarcely returned from Holland, and made known the decisions of Dort, when the king with the majority of the clergy, showed himself most averse from those decisions, and manifested a decided preference for the Arminian doctrine respecting the divine decrees.(46) That there were various causes for this unexpected change, will readily be believed by those acquainted with the history of those times: yet the principal cause, I apprehend, is to be sought in that rule for ecclesiastical reformation, which the founders of the new English church kept in sight. For they wished to render their church as similar as possible, to that which flourished in the first centuries; and that church, as no one can deny, was an entire stranger to the Dordracene doctrines.(47) The king becoming alienated from the Calvin-

(44) [It was a maxim with him, and one which he repeated at the Hampton Court conference: *No bishop, no king.* See *Neal*, loc. cit.—*Tr.*]

(45) See *Ant. Wood's* Athenæ Oxonienses, tom. i., p. 583. *Dan. Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. ii., ch. iv., p. 242 [ed. Boston, 1817, p. 111, 258, &c., and the long note of *Maclaine* on the text.—*Tr.*] *Clarendon's* History of the Rebellion, vol. i., p. 114, &c.

(46) *Peter Heylin's* History of the Five Articles, p. 444, &c., in the Dutch translation of Gerh. Brandt. *Dan. Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. ii., ch. ii., p. 117, &c. [ed. Boston, 1817, p. 135.—*Tr.*] *Neal* tells us, that the council of Dort was ridiculed in England, by the following verses, among other things;

Dordrechti Synodus, Nodus: Chorus integer, Æger:
Conventus, Ventus: Sessio, Stramen: Amen.

Moreover, for ascertaining the character and conduct of king *James*, and his inconstancy in religion, much aid is afforded by the writers of English history, and especially by *Larrey* and *Rapin Thoyras*. Most of these state, that in his last years *James* greatly favoured, not only the Arminians, but also the papists; and they tell us, there can be no doubt, the king wished to unite the English church with that of Rome. But in this, I apprehend, the king is too severely accused; although I do not deny, that he did many things not to be commended. It is not easy to believe, that a king who aspired immoderately after supreme and absolute sway, should wish to create to himself a lord, in the Roman pontiff. [Yet, see the following note.—*Tr.*] But at length, he inclined more towards the Romish church than formerly; and he permitted some things, which were coincident with the Romish rites and regulations; because with most of the bishops, he was persuaded that the ancient Christian church was the exemplar after which all churches should copy; that a religious community would be the more holy and the more perfect, the nearer its resemblance to the divine and apostolic standard; and that the Romish church retained more of the first and primitive form, than the *Puritan* or Calvinistic church did.

(47) Perhaps also the king was influenced by the recollection of the civil commotions, formerly excited in Scotland on account of the *Presbyterian* religion. There are some circumstances likewise, which indicate that

istic opinions and customs, the old hatred against the *Puritans*, which had somewhat subsided, again revived. And at last it broke out in open war. In short, *James* I. died in 1625, a mortal enemy of the *Puritan* faith, which he had imbibed in his youth; a decided patron and supporter of the Arminians, whose condemnation he had greatly promoted; and a very strenuous assertor of *Episcopal* government: and he left both the church and the commonwealth in a very fluctuating state, and languishing with intestine maladies.

§ 20. *Charles* I. the son of *James*, determined to perfect what his father had undertaken. He therefore used every effort, first, to extend the regal power and to exalt it above the authority of the laws; secondly, to subject the whole church of Great Britain and Ireland to the Episcopal form of government, which he considered as of divine appointment, and as affording the best security to the civil sovereign: and thirdly, to reduce the whole religion of the country to the pattern and form of the primitive church, rejecting all the doctrines and institutions of the Genevans. The execution of these designs was principally intrusted to *William Laud*, then bishop of London, and afterwards, from A.D. 1633, archbishop of Canterbury; who was in many respects, undoubtedly, a man of eminence, being a very liberal patron of learning and learned men, resolute, ingenuous, and erudite; but at the same time, too furious, headlong, and inconsiderate, inclined to superstition, and also bigotedly attached to the opinions, rites, and practices of the ancient Christians, and therefore a mortal enemy of the *Puritans* and of all Calvinists.(48) He prosecuted the objects of the king's wishes as well as his own, without any moderation; often disregarded and trampled upon the laws of the land; persecuted the Puritans most rigorously, and eagerly strove to extirpate them altogether; rejecting Calvinistic views in relation to predestination and other points, he after the year 1625, contrary to the wishes of *George Abbot*, substituted Arminian sentiments in place of them;(49) restored many ceremonies and rites which

the king, even before he came into England, was not wholly averse from the Romish religion. See the Bibliotheque Raisonée, tome xliii., p. 318, &c. [" Thus far the note of our author: and whoever looks into the Historical view of the Negotiations between the Courts of England, France, and Brussels, from the year 1592 to 1617, extracted from the MS. State Papers of Sir Thomas Edmondes and Anthony Bacon, Esq., and published in the year 1749, by the learned and judicious *Dr. Birch*, will be persuaded, that, towards the year 1595, this fickle and unsteady prince had really formed a design to embrace the faith of Rome. See in the curious collection now mentioned, the *Postscript* of a Letter from Sir *Thomas Edmondes* to the lord high-treasurer, dated the 20th of December, 1595. We learn also from the Memoirs of *Ralph Winwood*, that in the year 1596, *James* sent Mr. *Ogilby*, a Scots baron, into Spain, to assure his Catholic majesty, that he was then ready and resolved to embrace popery, and to propose an alliance with that king and the pope against the queen of England. See State Tracts, vol. i., p. 1. See also an extract of a letter from *Tobie Matthew*, D.D., dean of Durham, to the lord treasurer *Burleigh*, containing an information of Scotch affairs, in *Strype's* Annals, vol. iv., p. 201. Above all, see *Harris's* Historical and critical account of the Life and writings of James I., p. 29, note (N). This last writer may be added to *Larrey* and *Rapin*, who have exposed the pliability and inconsistency of this self-sufficient monarch."—*Mack.*]

(48) See *Anth. Wood's* Athenæ Oxonienses., tom. ii., p. 55, &c. *Peter Heylin's* Cyprianus Anglicus, or the History of the Life and Death of William Laud; London, 1668, fol. *Clarendon's* History of the Rebellion and the civil wars in England, vol. i. [*Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. ii., ch. iv., &c., and vol. iii., ch. v.—*Tr.*]

(49) See *Mich. le Vassor's* Histoire de Louis XIII., tome v., p. 262, &c. [*Laud* was then merely bishop of London, though in effect at the head of the established church. Legally, neither he nor any prelate, nor even

were indeed ancient, but at the same time superstitious and on that ground previously abrogated; obtruded bishops upon the Scotish nation, which was accustomed to the Genevan discipline and extremely averse to Episcopacy; and not obscurely showed, that in his view the Romish church, though erroneous, was a holier and better church, than those Protestant sects which had no bishops. Having by these acts excited immense odium, against the king and himself, and against the whole order of bishops, he was arraigned by the parliament in 1644, judged guilty of betraying the liberties and the religion of the country, and beheaded.(50) After the execution of *Laud*, the civil conflict which had long existed between the king and the parliament, attained such a height, that it could be extinguished by nothing short of the life blood of this excellent prince. The parliament inflamed by the *Puritans*, or by the *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, wholly abolished the old form of church government by bishops, and whatever else in doctrine, discipline, or worship, was contrary to the principles of the Genevans; furiously assailed the king himself, and caused him, when taken prisoner, to be tried for his life; and to the astonishment of all Europe, to be put to death, in the year 1648. Such are the evils resulting from zeal in religion, when it is illy understood, and is placed in external regulations and forms. Moreover, as is often found true, it appeared in these scenes of commotion, that almost all sects while oppressed, plead earnestly for charity and moderation towards dissenters; but when elevated to power, they forget their own former precepts. For the *Puritans*, when they had

the king, could abrogate or enact articles of faith, without the consent of Parliament. Nor was any such thing attempted. But the king, at the instigation (it is stated) of bishop *Laud*, issued a proclamation, January 24, 1626, which sets forth, "That the king will admit of no innovation in the doctrine, discipline, or government of the church, and therefore charges all his subjects, and especially the clergy, not to publish or maintain, in preaching or writing, any new inventions or opinions, contrary to the said doctrine and discipline established by law." This apparently harmless proclamation, was of course to be executed by *Laud* and his associates; and *Laud* was publicly accused of using it to punish and put down Calvinists, and to prevent their books from being printed and circulated, while Arminians were allowed to preach and to print *their* sentiments most fully. See *Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. ii., ch. iii., p. 192, &c., and vol. iii., ch. v., p. 222, &c., ed. Boston, 1817, and *Maclaine's* note (m) on this paragraph.—*Tr.*]

(50) [Archbishop *Laud* was impeached by the House of Commons, and tried before the House of Lords. In 1641, fourteen articles of impeachment were filed, and *Laud* was committed to prison. In 1644, ten additional articles were brought forward, and the trial now commenced. All the articles may be reduced to three general heads. I. That he had traitorously attempted to *subvert the rights of parliament, and to exalt the king's power above law.* II. That he had traitorously endeavoured to *subvert the constitution and fundamental laws of the land*, and to introduce arbitrary goverment, against law and the liberties of the subjects. III. That he had traitorously endeavoured and practised to subvert the true religion established by law, and to introduce popish superstition and idolatry. Under this last head, the specifications were, *first*, that he introduced and practised popish innovations and superstitious ceremonies, not warranted by law; such as images and pictures in the churches, popish consecration of churches, converting the communion-tables into altars, bowing before the altar, &c.; and *secondly*, that he endeavoured to subvert the Protestant religion, and encouraged Arminianism and popery; by patronising and advancing clergymen of these sentiments; by prohibiting the publication of orthodox books, and allowing corrupt ones free circulation; by persecuting in the high commission court, such as preached against Arminianism and popery; and by taking some direct steps towards a union with the church of Rome. The House of Lords deemed all the articles proved; but doubted, for a time, whether they amounted to treason. See the whole trial of *Laud*, in *Neal's* Hist. of the Puritans, vol. iii., ch. v., p. 184–255.—*Tr.*]

dominion, were no more indulgent to the bishops and their patrons, than these had formerly been to them.(51)

§ 21. The *Independents*, who have been just mentioned among the promoters of civil discord, are represented by most of the English historians, as more odious and unreasonable than even the *Presbyterians* or Calvinists; and are commonly charged with various enormities and crimes, and indeed with the parricide against *Charles* I. But I apprehend, that whoever shall candidly read and consider the books and the Confessions of the sect, will cheerfully acknowledge that many crimes are unjustly charged upon them; and that perhaps the misconduct of the *civil Independents*, (that is, of those hostile to the regal power, and who strove after extravagant liberty), has been incautiously charged upon the *religious Independents*.(52) They de-

(51) Besides Lord *Clarendon*, and the historians of England already mentioned, *Daniel Neal* has professedly treated of these events, in the 2d and 3d volumes of his History of the Puritans. [Compare also *Johnson Grant's* History of the English church and Sects, vol. ii., ch. x., xi., p. 127–303.—*Tr.*]

(52) The sect of the *Independents*, though a modern one and still existing among the English, is however less known than almost any Christian sect ancient or modern; and on no one, are more marks of infamy branded without just cause. The best English historians heap upon it all the reproaches and slanders, that can be thought of; nor is it the *Epicopalians* only who do this, but also those very *Presbyterians* with whom they are at this day associated. They are represented not only as delirious, crazy, fanatical, illiterate, rude, factious, and strangers to all religious truth and to reason, but also as criminals, seditious parricides, and the sole authors of the murder of *Charles* I. *John Durell*, (whom that most strenuous vindicator of the *Independents Lewis du Moulin* commends for his ingenuousness: see *Anth. Wood's* Athenæ Oxonienses, tom. ii., p. 732, 733), in his Historia rituum sanctæ ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, cap. i., p. 4, London, 1672, 4to, says: Fateor, si atrocis illius tragediæ tot actus fuerint, quot ludicrarum esse solent, postremum fere Independentium fuisse.—Adeo ut non acute magis, quam vere, dixerit l'Estrangius noster: Regem primo a Presbyterianis interemptum, Carolum deinde ab Independentibus interfectum. Foreign writers, regarding these as the best witnesses of transactions in their own country, have of course thought proper to follow them; and hence, the *Independents* almost every where appear under a horrid aspect. But as every class of men is composed of dissimilar persons, no one will deny that in this sect also there were some persons who were turbulent, factious, wicked, flagitious, and destitute of good sense. Yet if that is also true, which all wise and good men inculcate, that the character and the principles of whole sects must be estimated, not from the conduct or words of a few individuals, but from the customs, habits, and opinions of the sect in general, from the books and discourses of its teachers, and from its public formularies and confessions; then I am either wholly deceived, or the *Independents* are wrongfully loaded with so many criminations.

We pass over what has been so invidiously written against this sect, by *Clarendon*, *Lawrence Eachard*, *Samuel Parker*, and many others; and to render this whole subject the more clear, we will take up only that one excellent writer, than whom though a foreigner, no one as the English themselves admit, has written more accurately and neatly concerning the affairs of England, namely *Rapin Thoyras*. In the twenty-first book of his immortal work, the Histoire d'Angleterre, vol. viii., p. 535, ed. second, [*Tindal's* translation, vol. ii., p. 514, fol.], he so depicts the *Independents*, that if they were truly what he represents them, they would not deserve to enjoy the light in their country, which they still do enjoy freely, and much less, to enjoy the kind offices and love of any good man. Let us look over particularly, and briefly comment on the declarations of this great man concerning them. In the first place he tells us, that after the utmost pains, he could not ascertain the origin of the sect: Quelque recherche que j'ai faite, je n'ai jamais pû decouvrir exactement le premiere origine de la secte ou faction des Independents. That a man who had spent seventeen years in composing a History of England, and consulted so many libraries filled with the rarest books, should have written thus, is very strange. If he had only looked into that very noted book, *Jo. Hornbeck's* Summa Controversiarum, lib. x., p. 775, &c., he might easily have learned, what he was ignorant of, after so much research. He proceeds to the doctrines of the sect, and says of them in general, that nothing could

rived their name from the fact, that they believed with the *Brownists*, that individual churches are all *Independent*, or subject to no foreign jurisdic-

be better suited to throw all England into confusion. Ce q'il y a de certain c'est q'ils avoient des principes tout à fait propres à mettre l'Angleterre en combustion, comme ils le firent effectivement. How true this declaration is, will appear from what follows. He adds, first respecting politics, they held very pernicious sentiments. For they would not have a single man preside over the whole state; but thought the government of the nation should be intrusted to the representatives of the people. Par rapport au gouvernement de l'Etât, ils abhorroient la monarchie, et n'approuvoient qu'un gouvernement republicain. I can readily believe, that there were persons among the Independents unfriendly to monarchy. Such were to be found among the *Presbyterians*, the *Anabaptists*, and all the sects which then flourished in England. But I wish to see decisive testimony adduced, if it can be, to prove this the common sentiment of this whole sect. Such testimony is in vain sought for, in their public writings. On the contrary, in the year 1647 they publicly declared, "that they do not disapprove of any form of civil government, but do freely acknowledge that a kingly government, bounded by just and wholesome laws, is both allowed by God, and a good accommodation unto men." See *Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. iii., p. 146, [ed. Boston, 1817, p. 161]. I pass over other proofs equally conclusive, that they did not abhor all monarchy. Their religious opinions, according to our author, were most absurd. For if we may believe him, their sentiments were contrary to those of all other sects. Sur la religion, leurs principes étoient opposez à ceaux de tout le reste du monde. There are extant in particular, two Confessions of the *Independents;* the one of those in Holland, the other of those in England. The first was drawn up by *John Robinson*, the founder of the sect, and was published at Leyden, 1619, 4to, entitled: Apologia pro exulibus Anglis, qui Brownistæ vulgo appellantur. The latter was printed, London, 1658, 4to, entitled: A Declaration of the faith and order owned and practised in the Congregational churches in England, [more than one hundred in number, *Tr.*] agreed upon, and consented unto by their Elders and Messengers in their meeting at the Savoy, October 12, 1658. *John Hornbeck* translated it into Latin in 1659, and annexed it to his Epistle to Duræus, de Independentismo. From both these, —to say nothing of their other books,—it is manifest, that if we except the form of their church government, they differed in nothing of importance from the Calvinists or *Presbyterians*. But, to remove all doubt, let us hear the father of the Independents, *Robinson* himself, explaining the views of himself and his flock, in his Apologia pro exulibus Anglis, p. 7, 11. Profitemur coram Deo et hominibus, adeo nobis convenire cum ecclesiis Reformatis Belgicis in re religionis, ut omnibus et singulis earundem ecclesiarum fidei articulis, prout habentur in Harmonia Confessionum fidei, parati sumus subscribere——— Ecclesias Reformatas pro veris et genuinis habemus, cum iisdem in sacris Dei communionem profitemur et quantum in nobis est colimus. So far therefore, were they from differing altogether from all other sects of Christians, that on the contrary, they agreed exactly with the greatest part of the Reformed churches. To show by an example how absurd the religion of the *Independents* was, this eminent historian tells us, that they not only rejected all ecclesiastical government and order, but also made the business of preaching and praying in public and explaining the Scriptures, common to all. Non seulement ils ne pouvoient souffrir l'episcopat et l'hierarchie ecclesiastique; (This is true. But it was a fault not peculiar to them, but chargeable also on the *Presbyterians*, the *Brownists*, the *Anabaptists*, and all the sects of the *Nonconformists*), mais ils ne vouloient pas même qu'il y eut des ministres ordinaires dans l'Eglise. Ils soutenoient que chacun pouvoit prier en public, exhorter ses freres, expliquer l'Ecriture Sainte, selon les talens qu'il avoit reçus de Dieu.——Ainsi parmi eux chacun prioit, prechoit, exhortoit, expliquoit la S. Ecriture, sans autre vocation que celle qu'il tiroit lui même de son zele et des talens qu'il croyoit avoir, et sans autre autorité que celle, que luy donnoit l'approbation de ses Auditeurs. All this is manifestly false. The Independents employ, and have employed from the first, fixed and regular teachers; nor do they allow every one to teach, who may deem himself qualified for it. The excellent historian here confounds the *Independents* with the *Brownists*, who are well known to allow to all a right to teach. I pass over other assertions, notwithstanding they are equally open to censure. Now if such and so great a man, after residing long among the English, pronounced so unjust a sentence upon this sect, who will not readily pardon others much his inferiors, who have loaded this sect with groundless accusations? [On all these

tion; and that they should not be compelled to obey the authority and laws, either of bishops, or of councils composed of presbyters and delegates from several churches.(53) In this single opinion it is especially, that they dif-

charges, see *Neal's* history of the Puritans, vol. iii., ch. iv., p. 157, &c., ed. 1817.—*Tr.*]

But *this* (some one may say) is certain, from numberless testimonies, that the *Independents* put that excellent king *Charles* I. to death: and this single fact evinces the extreme impiety and depravity of the sect. I am aware that the best and most respectable English historians charge *them* alone with this regicide. And I fully agree with them, provided we are to understand by the term *Independents*, those persons who were hostile to regal power, and attached to an extravagant kind of liberty. But if the term is used to denote the ancestors of those *Independents* who still exist among the English, or a certain religious sect, differing from the other English sects in certain religious opinions, I am not certain that their assertion is quite true. Those who represent the *Independents* as the sole authors of the atrocious deed committed on *Charles* I. must necessarily mean to say, either that the nefarious parricides were excited to the deed by the suggestions and the doctrines of the *Independents*, or that they were all adherents to the worship and the doctrines of the *Independents:* neither of which is capable of solid proof. In the doctrines of the sect, as we have seen, there was nothing which could excite any one to attempt such a crime; nor does the history of those times show, that there was any more hatred or malevolence towards *Charles* I. in the *Independents*, than in the *Presbyterians*. And that all those who put the king to death were *Independents*, is so far from being true, that on the contrary, several of the best English historians, and even the edicts of *Charles* II. testify, that this turbulent company was mixed, and composed of persons of various religions. And I can easily admit, that there were some *Independents* among them. After all, this matter will be best unravelled by the English themselves, who know better than we, in what sense the term *Independents* must be used, when it is applied to those who brought *Charles* I. to the block. [According to *Neal*, loc. cit., vol. iii., p. 515, &c., 521, &c., 533, no one religious denomination is chargeable with the regicide, but only the army and the House of Commons, both of which were composed of men of various religions. Only two *Congregational* ministers approved the putting Charles to death; and the *Presbyterian* clergy in a body remonstrated against it.—*Tr.*]

When I have carefully inquired for the reasons why the *Independents* are taxed with so many crimes and enormities, three reasons especially have occurred to my mind. I. The term *Independents* is ambiguous, and not appropriated to any one class of men. For not to mention other senses of it, the term is applied by the English to those friends of *democracy*, who wish to have the people enact their own laws and govern themselves, and who will not suffer an individual or several individuals to bear rule in the state; or to adhere to the letter of the name, who maintain that the people ought to be *independent* of all control, except what arises from themselves. This faction, consisting in a great measure of mad fanatics, were the principal actors in that tragedy in England the effects of which are still deplored. Hence whatever was said or done extravagantly or foolishly by this faction, was I suspect, all charged upon our *Independents;* who were not indeed altogether without faults, yet were far better than they. II. Nearly all the English sects, which distracted the nation in the times of Charles I. and Oliver Cromwell, assumed the name of *Independents;* in order to participate in that public esteem, which the real *Independents* enjoyed on account of their upright conduct, and in order to screen themselves from reproach. This is attested, among others by *John Toland*, in his letter to *John le Clerc*, inserted by the latter in his Biblioth. Universelle et Historique, tome xxiii., pt. ii., p. 506. Au commencement tous les Sectaires se disoient *Independans*, par ce que ces derniers étoient fort honorez du peuple à cause de leur pieté. Now as the term was so extensively applied, who does not see that it might easily occur, that the enormities of various sects should be all charged upon the genuine *Independents*?—III. *Oliver Cromwell* the usurper, gave a preference to the *Independents* before all the other sects in his country. For he was as much afraid of the councils or *synods* of the Presbyterians, as he was of the bishops: but in the form of church government adopted by the Independents, there was nothing at all which he could fear. Now as men of like character incline to associate together, this circumstance might lead many to suppose, that the *Independents* were all of the same character with *Cromwell*, that is, very bad people.

(53) They undoubtedly received the name of *Independents*, from their maintaining that all assemblies of Christians had the right of self-government, or were *independent*. This

fer from the Presbyterians.(54) For whatever else they believe or teach on religious subjects, with very few exceptions and those not of much importance, is almost throughout in accordance with the Genevan doctrines. The parent of the sect was *John Robinson*, minister of a Brownist church which was settled at Leyden in Holland, a grave and pious man. Perceiving that the discipline which *Robert Brown* had set up, was in some respects defective, he undertook to correct it, and to give it such a form as would render it less odious than before. In two respects particularly, are the *Independents* better than the *Brownists:* first, in moderation and candour; for they did not, as *Brown* had done, execrate and pronounce unworthy of the Christian name, the churches that had adopted a different form of government; but they admitted that piety and true religion might flourish, where the ecclesiastical affairs were subject to the authority of *bishops* or to the decrees of *councils*, notwithstanding they considered their own form of government as of divine institution, and originating from Christ and his apostles. In the next place, the Independents excelled the *Brownists*, by abolishing that liberty of teaching which *Brown* had allowed equally to all the brethren. For they have regular teachers, elected by the whole brotherhood; and they do not allow any one to deliver discourses to the people, unless he has been previously examined and approved by the officers of the church. This sect, which began to exist in Holland in 1610, had very few adherents at first in England, and to escape the punishments decreed against *Nonconformists*, kept itself concealed;(55) but

very term is used by *John Robinson*, in his exposition of this doctrine in his Apologia pro exulibus Anglis, cap. v., p. 22, where he says: Cœtum quemlibet particularem (recte institutum et ordinatum) esse totam, integram, et perfectam ecclesiam ex suis partibus constantem immediate et *independenter* (quoad alias ecclesias) sub ipso Christo. And possibly from this very passage, the term *Independents* which was before unknown, had its origin. At first the followers of *Robinson* did not reject this appellation: nor has it any bad or odious import, provided it is understood in their own sense of it. In England, it was entirely unknown till the year 1640. At least, in the *Ecclesiastical Canons* enacted this year in the conventions held by the bishops of London and York, in which all the sects then existing in England are enumerated, there is no mention of the *Independents*. See the Constitutions and Canons ecclesiastical, treated upon by the Archbishops of Canterbury and Yorck, and the rest of the bishops and clergy in their several synods A.D. 1640, in *David Wilkin's* Concilia magnæ Britanniæ et Hyberniæ, vol. iv., cap. v., p. 548. But a little afterwards, and especially after the year 1642, this appellation is of frequent occurrence in the annals of English history. Nor did the English *Independents* at first, refuse to be called by this name; but rather, in their Apology published at London, 1644, 4to, (Apologetical Narration of the *Independents*), they fearlessly assume this name. But afterwards, when as we have remarked, many other sects adopted this name, and even seditious citizens who plotted the destruction of their king, were commonly designated by it, they very solicitously deprecated the application of it to them, and called themselves *Congregational Brethren*, and their churches *Congregational Churches*.

(54) [There are *two* points of difference between the Presbyterians and the Independents or Congregationalists. The *first* relates to the independence of individual churches, or their exemption from any foreign jurisdiction. The *second* relates to the location of the legislative and judicial powers of each church. The *Presbyterians* assign these powers to the *eldership* of the church, or to the pastor and the ruling elders assembled in a church session; but the *Independents* or *Congregationalists* confide them to a general meeting of all the male members of the church, or to the officers and the whole brotherhood assembled in a church meeting. From this latter principle it is, that the Independents are called *Congregationalists*. And as in modern times, they admit of a connexion or confederation of sister churches, which in some measure bounds and limits the *independence* of the individual churches, they have discarded the name of *Independents*.—*Tr.*]

(55) ["In the year 1616, *Mr. Jacob* who

on the decline of the power of the bishops in the time of *Charles* I., it took courage in the year 1640, and boldly showed itself in public. Afterwards it soon increased so much in reputation and in numbers, that it could compete for priority not only with the Episcopalians, but also with the very powerful *Presbyterians;* which must be attributed, among other causes to the erudition of its teachers, and to the reformed morals of the people.(56) During the reign of *Cromwell*, who for various reasons was its greatest patron, it was every where in the highest reputation: but on the restoration of the English monarchy under *Charles* II. it began to decline greatly, and gradually sunk into its former obscurity. At the present day, it exists indeed, but is timid and depressed; and in the reign of *William* III. A.D. 1691, it was induced by its weakness, to enter into a coalition (yet without giving up its own regulations) with the Presbyterians resident in London and the vicinity.(57)

had adopted the religious sentiments of *Robinson*, set up the first *Independent* or *Congregational* church in England."—*Macl.*]

(56) *Dan. Neal*, History of the Puritans, vol. ii., p. 107, 391, 393; vol. iii., p. 141, 145, 276, 303, 537, 549. *Anth. William Böhm's* Englische Reformationshistorie, book vi., ch. iv., p. 794. [A part of *Mr. Robinson's* congregation at Leyden, removed to *Plymouth* in New-England, in the year 1620. And during the reign of *Charles* I. and quite down to the end of the century, great numbers of the English *Independents* removed to New-England, and there formed flourishing colonies; so that New-England for about two centuries, has contained more Independents or Congregationalists, than Old England.—*Tr.*]

(57) From this time onward, they were called *United Brethren*. See *Jo. Toland's* letter, in *Jo. le Clerc's* Biblioth. Universelle et Historique, tome xxiii., p. 506. [It must not be supposed, that the distinction between *Presbyterians* and *Congregationalists* ceased in England, from the year 1691, or that both have ever since formed but one sect. They still exist as distinct, yet friendly sects. Being agreed in doctrines and anxious to hold communion with each other, notwithstanding their different modes of church government, they adopted these articles of agreement and consent; in which each sect endeavoured to come as near to the other, as their different principles would admit. Moreover, these Articles, with very slight alterations, were adopted by the Elders and Messengers of the churches of Connecticut, assembled at Saybrook in the year 1708; and they now form a part of what is called the Saybrook Platform, or the ancient ecclesiastical constitution of Connecticut. See *Trumbull's* History of Connecticut, vol. i., p. 510, 513, 514. The Articles themselves may be seen in *Toulmin's* History of Dissenters, vol ii., p. 130, &c., and in the Saybrook Platform, ed. New-London, 1759, p. 99, &c.—*Tr.*] *William Whiston* published the Articles of agreement, in the Memoirs of his life and writings, vol. ii., p. 549, &c. They are nine in number. The 1st treats "of Churches and Church Members." Here, in § 6, the Presbyterians and Independents declare, "that each particular church hath right to choose their own officers; and, hath authority from Christ for exercising government, and of enjoying all the ordinances of worship within itself:" and § 7, that "in the administration of church power, it belongs to the pastors and other elders of every particular church, (if such there be), to rule and govern; and to the brotherhood to consent according to the rule of the Gospel." Here both the Presbyterians and the Independents depart from their original principles. Article II. treats "of the Ministry, which they acknowledge to be an institution of *Christ*." They require the ministers of religion, not only to be pious, (§ 2), but also *learned;* and (§ 3, 4, 5) would have them be elected by the church with the advice of the neighbouring churches, and also solemnly ordained. Article III. "of Censures;" decrees that scandalous or offending members be first admonished; and if they do not reform, be excluded from the church, by the pastors; but with the consent of the brethren. Article IV. "of Communion of Churches;" declares all churches to be on a perfect equality, and therefore *independent;* yet makes it the duty of the pastors and teachers to maintain a kind of communion of churches, and often to meet together and consult on the interests of the churches. Article V. "of Deacons and ruling Elders." Here the United Brethren admit, that the office of Deacon or curator of the poor, is of divine appointment; and say: "Whereas divers are of opinion, that there is also the office of *ruling Elders*, who labour not in word and doctrine, and others think other

§ 22. While *Oliver Cromwell* administered the government of Great Britain, all sects even the vilest and most absurd, had full liberty to publish their opinions: the bishops alone and the friends of episcopal government, were most unjustly oppressed and stripped of all their revenues and honours. By far the most numerous and influential of all, were the *Presbyterians* and the *Independents;* the latter of whom were most favoured and extolled by *Cromwell*, (who however actually belonged to no sect), and manifestly for the sake of curbing more easily the *Presbyterians*, who sought to acquire dominion.(58) In this period arose the *Fifth-monarchymen*, as

wise, we agree, that this difference make no breach among us." Article VI. "of Synods;" admits, that it is useful and necessary, in cases of importance, for the ministers of many churches to hold a council; and that the decisions formed in these conventions must not be rejected by the churches, without the most weighty reasons. Article VII. "of our demeanour towards the civil Magistrate;" promises obedience to magistrates, and prayers for them. Article VIII. treats "of a Confession of Faith;" and leaves the brethren free to judge, whether the xxxix. Articles of the English church, or the Confession and Catechism of the Westminster assembly, that is, of the Presbyterians, or lastly, the Confession of the Congregational Brethren, published by the convention at the Savoy in 1658, be most agreeable to the Holy Scriptures. [Their words are: "As to what appertains to soundness of judgment in matters of faith, we esteem it sufficient, that a church acknowledge the Scriptures to be the word of God, the perfect and only rule of faith and practice; and own either the doctrinal part of those commonly called the Articles of the church of England, or the Confession, or Catechism, shorter, or larger, compiled by the assembly at Westminster, or the Confession agreed on at the Savoy, to be agreeable to the said rule."—*Tr.*] Article IX. "of our duty and deportment towards them that are not in Communion with us;" inculcates only love and moderation towards them. It hence appears, that the *Independents*, induced by necessity, approached in many points towards the opinions of the *Presbyterians*, and departed from the principles of their ancestors. [As respects union and communion of churches, their mutual accountability, and perhaps also the powers and prerogatives of church officers, there was some change in the views of the Independents of England, and also in America. But the English Presbyterians also softened considerably the rigours of Presbyterianism, as it was introduced and set up among them by the Scotch. This coalition of the two denominations tended to abate the zeal of both in maintaining the jus divinum of their respective systems of church government. For a considerable time, the Presbyterian and Congregational ministers in and near London continued to hold meetings for mutual consultation, and for regulating the licensure of candidates. And in some other counties of England, similar united meetings were held. But ere long they were dropped; and the two denominations, though on friendly terms with each other, manage respectively their own ecclesiastical affairs in their own way.—*Tr.*]

(58) [*Dr. Mosheim's* account of the Presbyterians is quite too meager for those who are expected to read this translation of his work. It is therefore deemed necessary, here to introduce a summary history, first of the *Scotish church*, and then of the *English Presbyterians*, during this century.

The *Scotish church*. From his first arrival in England in 1693, king *James* set himself to undermine Presbyterianism in Scotland, and to establish Episcopacy on its ruins. For this purpose, he not only spoke contemptuously of the Presbyterians as being insolent men and enemies to regal power, but actually nominated bishops to the thirteen Scotish bishoprics; and in 1606, obtained from the parliament of Perth, an act declaring the king to have sovereign authority over all estates, persons, and causes whatsoever, in Scotland; and also an act restoring to the bishops their ancient possessions, which had been annexed to the crown. This made the new bishops peers of the realm. The General Assembly protested. But in 1608, a convention claiming to be a General Assembly, declared the bishops perpetual moderators of all the Synods and Presbyteries. Another convention however was then sitting, in opposition to this; and committees from both attempted a compromise. The bishops carried their point in 1609: and the next year the king, contrary to law, authorized them to hold *High Commission Courts*. In the same year, (1610), a corrupt assembly was held at Glasgow, which sanctioned the right of the bishops to preside personally, or by their representatives, in all the judicatories of the church, in all cases of discipline, ordination and deprivation of ministers, visitation of churches, &c. All min-

they were called; delirious persons who would have turned the world up-

isters at their ordination, were to swear obedience to their ordinary; and all clergymen were forbidden to preach or to speak against the acts of this assembly, or to touch at all the subject of the parity of ministers. Three Scotish bishops, (*Spotswood*, *Lamb*, and *Hamilton*), were now sent to England, there to receive Episcopal consecration: and on their return, they consecrated the rest. In 1617, king *James* made a journey into Scotland, chiefly to further the cause of Episcopacy, which was advancing but slowly. The next year, (1618), a convention or General Assembly, composed very much of courtiers, met at Perth, and ordained kneeling at the sacrament, the administration of it in private houses and to the sick, the private baptism of children, their confirmation by bishops, and the observance of Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide, and Ascension Day. These were called the *five Articles of Perth*. They were published by royal authority; and in 1621, a Scotish parliament was persuaded, though not without difficulty, to enact them into laws, against the remonstrances of great numbers of the clergy. Persecution ensued; and many ministers were fined, imprisoned, and banished, by the High Commission Court. During this reign, many Scotch Presbyterians moved to the North of Ireland, and there established flourishing churches. *Charles* I. followed up the measures pursued by his father. In 1633, he went to Scotland to be crowned; and there compelled a Scotish parliament to invest him with all the ecclesiastical powers possessed by his father, and also to confirm the laws of the last reign respecting religion. On leaving Scotland, he erected a new bishopric at Edinburgh. And archbishop *Laud* drew up articles for regulating the royal chapel at Edinburgh: which was to be a pattern for all cathedrals, chapels, and parish churches. Hitherto the Scotch Episcopal church had no settled liturgy: the king therefore ordered the Scotch bishops to draw up canons and a liturgy, similar to those of the English church. These being revised by *Laud* and other English bishops, were imposed upon the whole Scotish nation, by royal proclamation; the canons in 1635, and the liturgy in 1636. The attempts of the bishops to enforce these, without the sanction of a General Assembly, or of a Scotish parliament, threw the whole nation into commotion. The nobles, gentry, burroughs, and clergy, combined to resist these innovations; and in 1638, they solemnly revived the national covenant of 1580 and 1590. Hence the king found it necessary to relax not a little, his injunctions; and he now permitted a General Assembly to be called. But his commissioners, finding this body unmanageable, dissolved it. The Assembly however would not separate, but protested; and continuing their sessions, they disannulled the acts of six preceding General Assemblies; (namely, those of 1606, 1608, 1610, 1616, 1617, and 1618); abolished Episcopacy; condemned the five articles of Perth, the liturgy, canons and high commission court; restored the Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies; and deposed all the bishops, save two, whom they allowed to remain as parish ministers. The king now resorted to war, and marched an army into Scotland in 1639. But a truce was concluded; and a new Assembly and a new parliament both met, and confirmed substantially the doings of the last Assembly. In 1640 the king raised another army, and renewed the war upon the Scots; but he found it necessary to agree again to a truce; and also to assemble an English parliament, which was called the long parliament, because it sat twelve years, and which favoured the Scots in their controversy with the king. His English subjects were now alienated from him; and to be able to contend with the English malecontents, the king concluded a peace with the Scots, by which he agreed to the total abolition of Episcopacy, and the entire restitution of Presbyterianism in that country. The peace however was of little service to him, as the English parliament and the Scots were on the most friendly terms. In 1642, the Scots offered to be mediators between the king and the English parliament; which the king resented highly. This drew closer the union between the Scots and the English parliament. The Scots now formed the design of establishing Presbyterianism, as the only religion throughout Great Britain and Ireland. To this project the English parliament, in order to secure the co-operation of the Scots in their war with the king, were led to yield assent. Commissioners from the General Assembly of Scotland, were now admitted to sit in the Westminster Assembly of divines; and the Scots had great influence in all the ecclesiastical affairs of England, till the time of *Cromwell's* usurpation. At their instance in 1643, the English parliament assented to the Scotch national Covenant somewhat modified, and now denominated the solemn League and Covenant; which the parliament recommended, and at length *enjoined* upon the whole English nation. The Scots strenuously opposed all toleration of any but Presbyterians, in either country.

side down. They taught that Jesus Christ would personally descend, and

This alienated the Independents, Baptists, and other sectarians from them; and the English parliament found it necessary to proceed with caution. In 1646, the king surrendered himself to the Scots; and they delivered him over to the English parliament; hoping thus to induce them resolutely to enforce Presbyterianism over the three kingdoms. But the parliament were so irresolute, that the Scots became jealous of them. After *Charles* I. was beheaded, in 1648, the Scots proclaimed *Charles* II. king; and declared against the English *Commonwealth*. In 1649, they entered into negotiations with the new king in Holland, who then professedly acceded to the national covenant. The next year, the king landed in Scotland; but his army was defeated by *Cromwell*. In 1651, *Charles* II. was crowned in Scotland; and then swore to observe the solemn League and Covenant. After this he marched an army into England, suffered a total defeat, and fled in disguise to France. General *Monk*, whom *Cromwell* had left in Scotland, soon brought that whole country to submit, and to become united with the Commonwealth of England; and also to allow a free toleration, to which the Presbyterians were much opposed. Commissioners were now sent into Scotland by the English parliament, to establish liberty of conscience there. Thus things remained till the restoration. Presbyterianism was the established religion of Scotland; but dissenters were allowed to live in peace, and to worship in their own way. At the restoration in 1661, a Scotish parliament rescinded all acts and covenants relative to religion, made or entered into since the commencement of the civil troubles, and empowered the king to settle the ecclesiastical establishment at his pleasure. He ordained Presbyterianism for the present; but soon after, though with some hesitation, ordered Episcopacy in its place. *Sharp*, *Fairfoul*, *Leighton*, and *Hamilton*, were consecrated bishops. Under *Charles* II. from 1662 to 1685, the Scotch Presbyterians suffered, very much as the English Non-conformists did; for similar laws and measures were adopted in both countries. *James* II. pursued the same persecuting course, till the year 1687, when in order to advance popery, he granted universal toleration. On the revolution in 1688, the Scotch Presbyterian church regained all its liberties and prerogatives; which it has enjoyed with little diminution to the present day. But the troubles it experienced during the reigns of *James* I. and his sons, had induced many Scotch Presbyterians to emigrate to the North of Ireland, to North America, and elsewhere. See *Neal's* Hist. of the Puritans: *Crookshank's* Hist. of the state and sufferings of the church of Scotland; *Burnet's* Hist. of his own times; *Spotswood*, and various others.

The *English Presbyterians*. Most of the early English Puritans, from their intercourse with the foreign Reformed churches who were all Presbyterians, were more or less attached to Presbyterian forms of worship and church government. But as the English bishops, in the reign of queen *Elizabeth*, generally admitted the validity of foreign or Presbyterian ordination; while the Puritans or Presbyterians on the other hand, admitted the validity of ordination by bishops, and the lawfulness of bishops of some sort; hence the principal difficulty of the English Puritans or Presbyterians, in those times, related to the rites of *worship*. (*Neal*, Hist. of Puritans, vol. i., p. 386). In the year 1572, several of the more strenuous Puritans, despairing of any farther reformation of the English church by public authority, proceeded secretly to organize the first Presbyterian church in England, at Wandsworth, five miles from London. This church, though persecuted, continued to exist: and others were formed on the model of it. But the greater part of the clergy who were inclined to Presbyterian views, remained in connexion with the established church, and bore the general appellation of Puritans. Many of them however, kept up voluntary meetings among themselves, for mutual advice and counsel, in a kind of presbyteries and synods. In the year 1586, there were more than 500 such ministers in England. How long and how extensively these informal and voluntary meetings were maintained, it is difficult to say. But this is certain, that although persecution induced great numbers to remove to America, Ireland, and elsewhere, yet the number of Presbyterians that remained, under the general appellation of Puritans, was very considerable; and it greatly increased, during the reigns of *James* I. and *Charles* I., prior to the year 1642, when Episcopacy was abolished by act of parliament. In 1643, the English parliament selected 121 of the ablest divines of England, with 30 lay assessors, whom they commanded to meet at Westminster and aid them by their counsel, in settling the government, worship, and doctrines of the church of England. This was the famous Westminster Assembly of divines; which continued to meet, and to discuss such subjects as the parliament submitted to their considera-

tion, during several years. They were men of different sentiments, Presbyterians, Erastians, and Independents, with some moderate Episcopalians. But a great majority were Presbyterians. Besides, not long after this assembly met, the General Assembly of the Scotish church, at the request of the English parliament, sent four commissioners to this body, on condition that the whole Westminster Assembly and the parliament would take the solemn League and Covenant, and agree to establish one uniform religion throughout the three kingdoms. The parliament reluctantly assented to the condition, for the sake of securing the cooperation of the Scots in their political designs. Before the Scotish commissioners arrived, the Westminster Assembly commenced revising the 39 Articles; and went over the first 15, making some slight alterations. After the arrival of the Scotch commissioners, and the adoption of the solemn League and Covenant in Feb., 1644, the Assembly, by order of parliament, drew up an Exhortation to the people of England to assent to the solemn League. The November following, they were ordered to write a circular letter to the foreign Reformed churches, acquainting them with the proceedings in England. Through this Assembly, the parliament licensed preachers and directed all ecclesiastical affairs. They next drew up a Directory for public worship; which was sanctioned by the parliament in January, 1645. The same year, they drew up a Directory for the ordination of ministers, and a Directory for church discipline and government. After warm debate, the majority of the Assembly declared for Presbyterianism, as of divine institution; but the parliament voted for it, only as "lawful, and agreeable to the word of God." The Assembly also put the supreme ecclesiastical power wholly into the hands of the church judicatories; but the parliament imposed restrictions, and to the great dissatisfaction of the Scots and most of the English Presbyterians, allowed an appeal from the highest ecclesiastical judicatory to the parliament. In March, 1646, parliament ordered ruling elders to be chosen in all the churches of England; and also the erection of Presbyteries, Synods, and a General Assembly, for a trial of the system. The Scotch church objected to several imperfections in the Presbyterianism thus established by the English parliament, and particularly to the right of appeal in the last resort, from the ecclesiastical court to the parliament; and the English Presbyterians and the Westminster Assembly, sided with the Scotch. In May, 1647, the king being now in the hands of the Scots, the English Presbyterians determined to enforce Presbyterianism jure divino, on all England; and to allow no toleration of dissenters. For this purpose, they caused a strong remonstrance to be presented to the parliament, in the name of the lord mayor, aldermen, and common council of London; and they were supported by the whole weight of the Scotish nation. On the contrary, the Independents and other sectarians in the army, procured a counter petition from numerous citizens of London. The commons were divided in sentiment, and at a loss how to proceed. To gain time, they demanded of the Westminster Assembly, scripture proofs for that jus divinum in church government, which they had maintained. It may be remarked, that from 1644 to 1647, the Independents who were rapidly increasing in number, uniformly pleaded for the free toleration of all sects holding the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. And the parliament was not unwilling to admit toleration, at least of the Independents; but the Presbyterians were utterly opposed to it; and *their* influence prevented the parliament from pursuing the course they would have done. This it was, alienated the Independents and the army from Presbyterianism, and from the parliament; and finally led to the subversion of the whole Presbyterian establishment set up in England. The demand of the house of commons for scriptural proof of the divine authority of Presbyterianism, produced long and warm debates in the Westminster Assembly. The Erastians and Independents at length protested, and withdrew. The Presbyterians, 53 in number, now left alone, voted with but one dissenting voice, that "Christ has appointed a church government distinct from the civil magistrates." On the other points referred to them, they were afraid to report their views, lest the parliament should put them under a præmunire. But the Presbyterian divines of London met at Zion College, answered fully the questions of the house of commons, and maintained in strong terms the jus divinum of Presbyterianism. Yet in a second meeting, they lowered their tone somewhat; and agreed to set up the limited Presbyterianism, already sanctioned by the parliament. This consisted of parochial presbyteries (or church sessions), classes (or presbyteries), provincial assemblies (or synods), and a national assembly; with an appeal to the parliament in the last resort. The Province of London was now distributed into 12 classes, containing 138 parochial presbyteries. The next year, (1647), provincial assemblies (synods) actually met in London, and in Lancashire

and in those counties only, under the act of parliament. The provincial assembly of London continued to meet semi-annually, till the end of *Cromwell's* reign. In the other parts of England, the Presbyterians continued to meet in their voluntary conventions for ecclesiastical affairs, which had not the sanction of law. The king though a prisoner, refused his assent to this new ecclesiastical constitution of England. At the same time, he tried to detach the Scots from the English, by promising them Presbyterianism for Scotland, with Episcopacy for England. But they rejected his offers, hoping still to bless England as well as Scotland with Presbyterianism jure divino. He also tried to gain over the Independents, by promising them free toleration: but they would not accept it for themselves alone. The country now swarmed with sectarians, and with numerous lay preachers of every description. *Thomas Edwards* in his Gangræna, mentions sixteen sects; namely, Independents, Brownists, Millenaries, Antinomians, Anabaptists, Arminians, Libertines, Familists, Enthusiasts, Seekers, Perfectionists, Socinians, Arians, Antitrinitarians, Antiscripturists, and Skeptics. *Mr. Baxter* mentions the Independents, Anabaptists, and Antinomians, as being the chief separatists from the established or Presbyterian church: to whom, he adds Seekers, Ranters, Behemists, and Varists, which either became extinct, or were merged in the Quakers. The English divines would have been satisfied with revising the 39 Articles; and therefore commenced such a revision. But the Scotch divines insisted on a new Confession. Hence the Westminster Assembly, after the arrival of the Scotch commissioners, drew up their elaborate Confession; which the house of commons approved, with some amendments, in the summer of 1647, and the winter following. But the house of lords objecting to the articles on church government, only the doctrinal part of the Confession obtained parliamentary sanction, in the year 1648. The Scotch nation adopted the Confession as drawn up by the Assembly. The Assembly's Shorter Catechism was presented to parliament in 1647; and the Larger Catechism, in 1648. Both were allowed to be used, by authority of the English parliament. The Scotch commissioners in the Assembly, now returned home; but the Assembly was continued as a sort of counsel to parliament, yet it did little else than to license preachers. The army being composed chiefly of dissenters from the establishment, of various descriptions, upon finding that no toleration of dissenters was allowed by the new ecclesiastical constitution, demanded of the parliament free toleration for *all* Protestant dissenters. This the Presbyterians vigorously opposed: and the parliament endeavoured to disband the army. But the army now rescued the king from the hands of the parliament, and became peremptory in their demands. Pressed by the Presbyterians on the one hand, and by the army on the other, parliament wavered for a time, but at length fell under the control of the army, and not only allowed of dissent from the establishment, but also made no vigorous efforts to set up Presbyterianism. But in May, 1648, the Scots having made a separate treaty with the king, invaded England, in order to rescue him. The war obliged the army to march in various directions; and the Presbyterians seized the opportunity in the parliament, to enforce Presbyterianism. An act was proposed, declaring eight specified heresies to be capital crimes; and sixteen others to be punishable with unlimited imprisonment. The act was not passed. But in June following, another did pass, placing "all parishes and places whatsoever in England and Wales," except chapels of the king and peers, under the Presbyterian government, with allowance of no other worship; yet without making it penal to neglect this worship. The parliament likewise commenced a negotiation with the king for his restoration, upon the basis of a single religion, with no toleration of any other. The king insisted on Episcopacy of some sort; and the parliament, on Presbyterianism The army, after repelling the Scotch invasion, finding that neither the king nor the parliament intended ever to allow toleration to sectaries, again seized the king's person; and marching to London, sifted the house of commons, new modelled the government, and caused the king to be impeached and beheaded. The *Commonwealth*, without a king or a house of lords, was now set up. But the Scots refused to acknowledge it, recognised *Charles* II. for their king, and threatened war upon England. The English Presbyterians took sides with their Scotish brethren, disowned the parliament, and declared against a general toleration. All people were now required to swear fidelity to the new government; which many of the Presbyterian clergy refusing to do, were turned out. However, to conciliate the Presbyterians, the parliament continued the late Presbyterian establishment; but repealed all acts compelling uniformity. The Scots, aided by the English Presbyterians, invaded England in order to place *Charles* II. on the throne: but they were vanquished, and all Scotland was compelled to submit to the parliament, and moreover to al-

establish a new and heavenly kingdom on the earth.(59) Here arose the *Quakers*, to whom, as they have continued to the present time, we shall devote a separate chapter. Here the furious *Anabaptists* were allowed to

low of toleration in their own country. The solemn League and Covenant was laid aside; and nothing but the *Engagement*, (or oath of allegiance to government), was required of any man, to qualify him civilly for any living in the country. Hence many Episcopal divines, as well as those of other denominations, became parish ministers. In the year 1653, the army being offended with the parliament, (which had now sitten twelve years, and during the last four had ruled without a king or house of lords), ordered them to disperse: and general *Cromwell* with the other officers, appointed a new council of state, and selected 140 men from the several counties to represent the people. After five months, these new representatives resigned their power to *Cromwell* and the other officers; who framed a new constitution, with a single house of representatives, chosen in the three kingdoms, and a Protector with ample executive powers, elected for life. All sects of Christians, except papists and Episcopalians, were to have free toleration. *Cromwell* the Protector, laboured to make persons of all religions feel easy under him; but he absolutely forbid the clergy's meddling with politics. Ministers of different denominations in the country towns, now began to form associations for brotherly counsel and advice. But the more rigid Presbyterians, as well as the Episcopalians, stood aloof from such associations. The right of ordaining parish ministers, had for some years been exclusively in the hands of the Presbyterians; but *Cromwell*, in March, 1654, appointed a board of thirty *Tryers*, composed of Presbyterians and Independents with two or three Baptists, to examine and license preachers throughout England. The same year, he appointed lay commissioners in every county, with full power to eject scandalous, ignorant, and incompetent ministers and schoolmasters. Both these ordinances were confirmed by parliament. Such was the state of the English Presbyterians, during the protectorate of *Oliver Cromwell*. On the accession of his son, *Richard Cromwell*, the Presbyterians seeing no prospect of the restoration of the solemn League and Covenant, or of their obtaining ecclesiastical dominion over England under the existing form of government, formed a coalition with the royalists in 1659, in order to restore the king. The remains of the long parliament were resuscitated, and placed over the nation. The members excluded from it in 1648, were recalled, and took their seats; and thus it became more than half Presbyterian. This parliament in 1660, voted that the concessions offered by the king in the negotiations at the Isle of Wight in 1648, were satisfactory; restored Presbyterianism completely, together with the solemn League and Covenant; appointed a new council of state; ordered that a new parliament should be chosen; and then dissolved. The Presbyterians, who now had the whole power of the country in their own hands, were so zealous to prevent the election of republicans to the new parliament, that when it met it was decidedly in favour of a monarchy. Parliament now recalled the king, without making any stipulations with him respecting the religion of the country. He very soon restored episcopacy; and then would grant no toleration to any class of dissenters. The Presbyterians, who had the most to lose, were the greatest sufferers. Some hundreds of their ministers were immediately displaced, to make way for the old Episcopalian incumbents. And in 1662, the act of uniformity made it criminal to dissent from the established or Episcopal church; and of course it exposed all dissenters to persecution. A number of the Presbyterian ministers conformed, in order to retain their places; but more than 2000 ministers, most of them Presbyterians, were turned out. And during this and the succeeding reign, or till the accession of *William* and *Mary* in 1688, the Presbyterians equally with the other dissenters, suffered persecution. For though the kings, after the year 1672, were inclined to give toleration to all, in order to advance popery, yet parliament and the bishops resisted it. When the revolution in 1688, placed a tolerant sovereign on the throne, and thus relieved the English Presbyterians from persecution, they were comparatively an enfeebled and humbled sect; and being no longer strenuous for the solemn league and covenant and for the jus divinum of Presbyterianism, they were willing to have friendly intercourse and fellowship with Independents, and soon became as catholic in their views as most of the other English dissenters. See *Heylin's* History of the Presbyterians: *Neal's* Hist. of the Puritans; *Bogue* and *Bennet's* Hist. of Dissenters; *Baxter's* Hist. of his own Times; *Burnet's* Hist. of his own Times; *Grant's* Hist. of the English church and sects; and others.—*Tr.*]

(59) *Burnet's* Hist. of his own Times, vol. i., p. 67. [*Neal's* Hist. of the Puritans, vol. iv., ch. v., p. 113, 343, &c.—*Tr.*]

utter freely, whatever a disordered mind might suggest.(60) Here the *Deists*, who reduced all religion to a very few precepts inculcated by reason and the light of nature, gathered themselves a company with impunity, under their leaders *Sidney*, *Henry Neville*, *Martin*, *Harrington*, and others.(61)

§ 23. During this period also, arose among the Presbyterians the party called *Antinomians*, or enemies of the law, as they are called by their adversaries; which has continued to our day, and has caused at times no little commotion. The *Antinomians* are over-rigid Calvinists, who are thought by the other *Presbyterians*, to abuse *Calvin's* doctrine of the absolute decrees of God to the injury of the cause of piety.(62) Some of them, (for they do not all hold the same sentiments), deny that it is necessary for ministers to exhort Christians to holiness and obedience to the law; because those whom God from all eternity elected to salvation, will themselves and without being admonished and exhorted by any one, by a divine influence or the impulse of almighty grace, perform holy and good deeds; while those who are destined by the divine decrees to eternal punishment, though admonished and entreated ever so much, will not obey the law; nor *can* they obey the divine law, since divine grace is denied them: and it is therefore sufficient, in preaching to the people, to hold up only the Gospel and faith in Jesus Christ. But others merely(63) hold, that the elect, because they cannot lose the divine favour, do not truly commit sin and break the divine law, although they should go contrary to its precepts and do wicked actions; and therefore it is not necessary that they should confess their sins, or grieve for them: that adultery for instance, in one of the elect, appears to us indeed to be sin or a violation of the law, yet it is no sin in the sight of God; because one who is elected to salvation, can do nothing displeasing to God and forbidden by the law.(64)

§ 24. Certain wise and peace-loving persons, moved by the numerous calamities and sufferings of their country arising from the intemperate religious disputes, felt it to be their duty to search for a method of uniting in some measure such of the contending parties as would regard reason and religion, or at least of dissuading them from ruinous contentions.

(60) [*Dr. Mosheim* seems to have taken it for granted, that the English Baptists of this age, because they were called *Anabaptists*, resembled the old Anabaptists of Germany; whereas they were *Mennonites*, and though illiterate and somewhat enthusiastic, they were a people in whom was not a little Christian simplicity and piety.—*Tr.*]

(61) *Dan. Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. iv., p. 87, [ed. Boston, 1817, p. 112, 113.—*Tr.*]

(62) See *Jo. Toland's* Letter to Le Clerc; in the Bibliotheque Universelle et Historique of the latter, tome xxiii., p. 505, &c. *Jo. Hornbeck's* Summa controversiar., p. 800, 812, &c.

(63) [This second *Antinomian* opinion is so much worse than the preceding, that it is strange *Dr. Mosheim* should say of it: Alii vero *tantum* statuunt, others *merely* hold.—*Tr.*]

(64) Other tenets of the *Antinomians*, kindred with this, and the more recent disputes occasioned by the posthumous works of *Tobias Crisp*, (a distinguished Antinomian preacher), in which *Jo. Tillotson*, *Baxter*, and especially *Daniel Williams*, (in his celebrated work: Gospel truth stated and vindicated), vigorously assailed the Antinomians, are stated, though with some errors, by *Peter Francis le Courayer*, Examen des defauts theologiques, tome ii., p. 198, &c., Amsterd., 1744, 8vo. [See also *Bogue* and *Bennet's* Hist. of Dissenters, vol. i., p. 399, &c., and *Hannah Adams'* Dictionary of all religions, art. *Antinomians*. One of the chief sources of *Antinomian* opinions was, the received doctrine of *substitution*. If *Christ* took the *place of the elect*, and in *their stead* both obeyed the law perfectly, and suffered its penalty, it was hard for some to see what further demands the law could have upon *them*, or what more they had to do with it.—*Tr.*]

They therefore took middle ground between the more violent *Episcopalians* on the one part, and the more stiff *Presbyterians* and *Independents* on the other; hoping, that if the contentions of these could be settled, the minor parties would fall by their own arms. The contests of the former related partly to the forms of church government and public worship, and partly to certain doctrines, particularly those on which the Reformed and the Arminians were at variance. To bring both classes of contests to a close, these mediators laboured to bring the disputants off from those narrow views which they had embraced, and to exhibit a broader way of salvation. And hence they were commonly called *Latitudinarians*.(65) In the first place, they were attached to the form of church government and the mode of public worship established by the laws of England, and they recommended them exclusively to others: yet they would not have it believed, that these were of divine institution, and absolutely necessary. And hence they inferred, that those who approved other forms of church government and other modes of worship, were to be tolerated, and to be treated as brethren, unless they were chargeable with other faults. In the next place, as to religion they chose *Simon Episcopius* for their guide; and in imitation of him, maintained that there are but few things which a Christian *must* know and believe, in order to be saved. Hence it followed, that neither the *Episcopalians*, who embraced the sentiments of the Arminians, nor the *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, who adopted the sentiments of the Genevans, had just reason for contending with so much zeal and animosity: because their disputes related to unessential points, which might be explained variously, without the loss of salvation. The most distinguished of the *Latitudinarians* were the eminent *John Hales* and *William Chillingworth*, whose names are still in veneration among the English.(66) With them were joined *Henry More*, *Ralph Cudworth*, *Theophilus Gale*, *John Whitchcot*, *John Tillotson*, and various others. The first reward for their labours which these men received, was, to be called Atheists, Deists, and Socinians, not only by the papists, but also by the English dissentients. But on the restoration of the English monarchy under *Charles* II., they were advanced to the highest stations, and received general approbation. And it is well known, that the English church, at the present day [1753] is under the direction for the most part, of such *Latitudinarians*. Yet there are some among the bishops and the other clergy, who following rather in the steps of *Laud*, are denominated the *High Church* and *Ecclesiastical Tories*.(67)

(65) *Gilbert Burnet's* History of his own Times, book ii., vol. i., p. 186, &c.

(66) An accurately written life of the very acute *John Hales*, was published in English, by *Peter des Maizeaux*, London, 1719, 8vo. A Latin and more full history of the life of *Hales*, we have ourselves prefixed to his History of the Synod of Dort, Hamb., 1724, 8vo. A French life of him, but not entirely correct, is in the first volume of *Chillingworth's* book, immediately to be noticed, p. lxxiii, &c. A Life of *Chillingworth*, in English, was composed by the same *Des Maizeaux*, and published, London, 1725, 8vo. A French translation of it is prefixed to the French version of his very noted work: The religion of Protestants a safe way of salvation, printed at Amsterdam, 1730, in 3 vols. 8vo. Such as would acquaint themselves with the regulations, doctrines, and views of the church of England in later times, should acquaint themselves with these two men, and in particular, should carefully study the above-named work of *Chillingworth*.

(67) *Rapin Thoyras*, Dissertation on the Whigs and Tories: in his History of England, [French edition], vol. x, p. 234.—["See an admirable defence of the *Latitudinarian* divines, in a book entitled: The

§ 25. When *Charles* II. was restored to the throne of his father in 1660, the ancient forms of ecclesiastical government and public wroship returned also from exile, and the bishops recovered their lost dignities. Those who preferred other forms, or the *Nonconformists* as they were called in England, expected that some place would be assigned to them in the church: but their hopes were quickly disappointed. For *Charles* again placed bishops over the Scots, who were so religiously attached to the Genevan discipline; and likewise over the Irish. And afterwards, in the year 1662, all those who refused to subject themselves to the rites and institutions of the English church, were by a public law separated wholly from its communion.(68) From this period till the times of *William* and *Mary*, the *Nonconformists* experienced various fortune, sometimes more pleasant and sometimes more sad, according to the disposition of the court and the government; but at no time were they so happy, as not either to feel or fear persecution.(69) But in the year 1689, *William* III. by an express act of parliament, freed all dissenters from the established church (except Socinians) from all liability to the penalties to which they were by law exposed.(70) He also permitted the Scotish nation to live under their Genevan regulations, and delivered them from the jurisdiction of bishops. This therefore may be regarded as the commencement of that liberty and freedom from molestation, which are still enjoyed by the sects that dissent from the public rites of the English church; but it was also the commencement of those numerous parties and sects, which spring up from year to year in that fortunate island, often as suddenly as mushrooms, and which distract the people with their new inventions and opinions.(71)

§ 26. In the reign of this *William* III., A.D. 1689, arose a very noted schism in the English Episcopal church, which quite down to the present times, no means have been able to remove. *William Sancroft* archbishop of Canterbury, and seven other bishops,(72) all men distinguished

principles and Practices of certain moderate Divines of the Church of England (greatly misunderstood) truly represented and defended, London, 1670, 8vo. This book was written by *Dr. Fowler*, afterwards bishop of Gloucester."—*Macl.*]

(68) *Dan. Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. iv., p. 358, [ed. Boston, 1817, p. 396, &c.] *Rapin Thoyras*, Histoire d'Angleterre, tome ix., p. 198, &c. *David Wilkins*, Concilia magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, tom. iv, p. 573. [This was the famous *Act of Uniformity*, which required all clergymen not only to use the liturgy, but also to swear to renounce and condemn the solemn League and Covenant, Presbyterian ordination, and all efforts for changing the present establishment. In consequence of this Act, about 2000 ministers, chiefly *Presbyterians*, were turned out of their churches, because they could not conform to the law. At the same time, all the old laws against conventicles, neglect of the parish churches, &c., were revived; and these made all *Nonconformists* liable to civil prosecution.—*Tr.*]

(69) *Daniel Neal* treats particularly of these events, in the 4th volume of his History of the Puritans.

(70) This *Act* which is called *The Toleration Act*, is subjoined to *Dan. Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. iv., [ed. Boston, 1817, vol. v., p. 386, &c. By it all dissenters from the church of England, except papists and Anti-trinitarians, by taking an oath of allegiance, and subscribing to the doctrinal part of the 39 Articles, (or if *Quakers*, making equivalent affirmations), are exempted from all the penalties prescribed by the Acts which enforce uniformity; and are allowed to erect houses of worship, have their own preachers, and to meet and worship according to their own views, provided they do not when met lock or bolt their doors. They are not however exempted from tithes, and other payments for the support of the established churches; nor are they excused from the oaths required by the Corporation and Test Acts, which exclude Nonconformists from all civil offices.—*Tr.*]

(71) *Gilbert Burnet's* History of his own Times, vol. ii., p. 23, &c.

(72) ["The other Non-Juring bishops

for their learning and purity of morals, declared that they could not in conscience take the oath of fidelity to the new king, *William* III., because *James* II., though expelled from the kingdom, was in their view, the legitimate king of England, As no arguments could induce them to recede from this opinion, they were deprived of their offices in 1690, by a decree of the English parliament; and other bishops were appointed in their places.(73) The bishops who were deposed and turned out of their episcopal dwellings, founded a new church in the bosom of the English church, differing from the rest of the church in opinions, in the form of worship, and in other respects.(74) From the cause that produced the disunion, this church was called that of *Non-Jurors;* and on account of the opinion, which it maintained and continues to maintain, respecting the authority of the church, it received the name of *High Church;* that is, one entertaining very exalted ideas of the prerogatives and authority of the church: to which is opposed the *Low Church*, or that which has more moderate views of the power of the church.(75) The deprived bishops with their friends and followers, contended that the church is not subject to the civil authority and to parliaments, but to God only; and that it has the power of self-government: and consequently, that the decree of parliament against them was unjust and a nullity; and that an ecclesiastical council only, has power by its decrees to deprive a bishop of his office. The celebrated *Henry Dodwell* was the first that contended fiercely for these rights and this power of the church. He was followed by several others: and hence arose this perplexing and difficult controversy respecting the church, which has not yet closed, and which is renewed with zeal from time to time.(76)

were *Dr. Lloyd*, bishop of Norwich; *Dr. Turner*, of Ely; *Dr. Kenn*, of Bath and Wells; *Dr. Frampton*, of Gloucester; *Dr. Thomas*, of Worcester; *Dr Lake*, of Chichester; *Dr. White*, bishop of Peterborough."—*Macl.*]

(73) ["These were *Tillotson*, *Moore*, *Patrick*, *Kidder*, *Fowler*, and *Cumberland*, names that will ever be pronounced with veneration by such as are capable of esteeming solid, well-employed learning and genuine piety, and that will always shine among the brightest ornaments of the church of England."—*Macl.*]

(74) [The language of *Dr. Mosheim* here, would seem to imply, that the Non-Juring bishops produced a formal secession from the established church, and erected a permanent sect, which differed in doctrines and in its forms of worship from the church of England. But it was only a temporary disagreement, whether *William* III. or *James* II. was the legal sovereign; and, of course, whether those bishops and priests, who were deprived for not taking the oath of allegiance to the former, or those who were appointed to fill their places, were the legitimate bishops and parish ministers. Both parties professed the same faith, adhered to the same discipline, and used the same liturgy, except that the Non-Jurors are said to have framed and used a prayer for king *James* and for their party. It was rather a political than a religious schism; and one which necessarily terminated on the death of the pretender, and of the deprived bishops and clergy. Some principles indeed, which were then contended for, continued to be maintained, after they became little more than points of theoretical speculation; and the believing or disbelieving these principles, soon constituted the only difference between the two parties.—*Tr.*]

(75) The name of *High Church*, that is, of those who have high notions of the church and its power, properly belongs to the *Non-Jurors*. But it is usual among the English to give it a more extensive application; and to apply it to all those who extol immoderately the authority of the church and declare it exempt from all human power, notwithstanding they do not refuse to swear allegiance to the king. And there are many such, even in that church which generally goes under the name of the *Low Church*. [The *Non-Jurors* were also called *Jacobites*, from their adherence to *James* II. and his son the pretender, in opposition to the reigning sovereign and the house of Hanover. The Scotish bishops, after the year 1688, all adhered to the house of *Stuart*, and were called *Non-Jurors*, because they refused the oath of allegiance to the reigning sovereign.—*Tr.*]

(76) [*Henry Dodwell*, senior, was appoint-

§ 27. The *Non-Jurors* or *High Church*, who claimed for themselves the appellation of the *Orthodox* and called the *Low Church* the *Schismatical*, differed from the rest of the Episcopal church in several particulars and regulations, but especially in the following sentiments. I. That it is never lawful for the people, under any provocation or pretext whatever, to resist their kings and sovereigns. The English call this the doctrine of *passive obedience;* the opposite of which, is the doctrine of *active obedience*, held by those who deem it lawful in certain cases, for the people to oppose their rulers and kings. II. That the hereditary succession of kings is of divine appointment; and therefore, it can be set aside or annulled in no case whatever. III. That the church is subject to the jurisdiction, not of the civil magistrate, but of God only, particularly in matters of a religious nature. IV. That consequently, *Sancroft* and the other bishops who were deposed under king *William* III. remained the true bishops as long as they lived; and that those substituted in their places, were the unjust possessors of other men's property. V. That these unjust possessors of other men's offices, were both bad citizens and bad members of the church, or were both rebels and schismatics; and therefore, that such as held communion with them were chargeable with rebellion and schism. VI. That schism, or splitting the church in pieces, is the most heinous sin; the punishment due to which, no one can escape, but by returning with sincerity, to the true church from which he has revolted.(77)

§ 28. We now pass over to the Hollanders, the neighbours of the English. The ministers of the Dutch churches thought themselves happy, when the opposers of the Calvinistic doctrine of decrees or the Arminians, were vanquished and put down: but it was not their fortune to enjoy tranquillity very long. For after this victory, they unfortunately fell into such contests among themselves, that during nearly the whole century, Holland was the scene of very fierce animosity and strife. It is neither easy nor important, to enumerate all these contentions. We shall therefore omit the disputes between individual doctors, respecting certain points both of doctrine and discipline; such as the disputes between those men of high reputation, *Gisbert Voët* and *Samuel Maresius* [*Des Marets*]; the disputes about false hair, interest for money, stage plays, and other minute questions of morals, between *Salmasius*, *Boxhorn*, *Voët*, and several others; and the contests respecting the power of the magistrate in matters of re-

ed Camden professor of History at Oxford in 1688; and being deprived of the office in 1690, because he refused the oath of allegiance, he published a vindication of the non-juring principles. Several other tracts were published by him and others on the same side; none of which were suffered to go unanswered. In 1691, *Dr. Humphrey Hody* published his *Unreasonableness of Separation*, or *a Treatise out of ecclesiastical history, showing, that although a bishop was unjustly deprived, neither he nor the church ever made a separation, if the successor was not a heretic;* translated out of *an ancient Greek manuscript*, (written at Constantinople, and now among the *Baroccian* MSS.), *in the public library at Oxford.* This was answered by *Dodwell* the next year, in his *Vindication of the deprived bishops*, &c. *Dr. Hody* replied, in *The case of the Sees vacant*, &c. In 1695, *Dodwell* came forth again, in his *Defence of the Vindication of the deprived bishops.* Various others engaged in this controversy. See *Maclaine's* Note; *Calamy's* Additions to *Baxter's* Hist. of his own life and times, ch. xvii., p. 465, &c., ch. xviii., p. 484, &c., 506, &c.—*Tr.*]

(77) See *William Whyston's* Memoirs of his own life and writings, vol. i., p. 30, &c. *George Hick's* Memoirs of the life of John Kettlewell, London, 1718, 8vo, who treats expressly and largely on these matters. Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. et Critique, article *Collier*, tome ii., p 112. *Phil. Masson's* Histoire Critique de la Republic des Lettres, tome xiii., p. 298, &c., and elsewhere.

ligion, carried on by *William Appollonius*, *James Trigland*, *Nicholas Vedel*, and others, and which destroyed friendship between *Frederic Spanheim* and *John van der Wayen*. For these and similar disputes, show what were the sentiments of certain eminent divines respecting particular doctrines and points of morality, rather than lay open the internal state of the church. The knowledge of the latter, must be derived from those controversies alone, which disquieted either the whole church or at least a large portion of it.

§ 29. The principal controversies of this sort, were those respecting the Cartesian philosophy, and the new opinions of *Cocceius:* for these have not yet terminated, and they have produced two very powerful parties, the *Cocceians* and the *Voëtians;* which once made a prodigious noise, though now they are more silent. The Cocceian theology and the Cartesian philosophy have no natural connexion; and therefore the controversies respecting them were not related to each other. Yet it so happened that the followers of these two very distinct systems of doctrine, formed very nearly one and the same party, those who took *Cocceius* for their guide in theology, adhering to *Des Cartes* as their master in philosophy;(78) because those who assailed the Cartesians, attacked also *Cocceius* and his followers, and opposed both with equal animosity. Hence the Cartesians and Cocceians were under a kind of necessity to unite and combine their forces, in order the better to defend their cause against such a host of adversaries. The *Voëtians* derived their name from *Gisbert Voët*, a very famous divine of Utrecht, who set up the standard as it were, in this war, and induced great numbers to attack both *Des Cartes* and *Cocceius*.

§ 30. The Cartesian philosophy, which at its first appearance was viewed by many even in Holland as preferable to the Peripatetic, was first assailed by *Gisbert Voët* in 1639, at Utrecht, where he taught theology with very great reputation, and who not obscurely condemned this philosophy as blasphemous. *Voët* was a man of immense reading and multifarious knowledge, but indifferently qualified to judge correctly on metaphysical and abstract subjects. While *Des Cartes* resided at Utrecht, *Voët* censured various of his opinions; but especially the following positions, which he feared were subversive of all religion; namely, that one who intends to be wise, must begin by calling every thing in question, even the existence of God: that the essence of *spirits* and even of God himself, consists in *thought:* that *space*, in reality, has no existence, but is a mere fiction of the imagination; and therefore, that *matter* is without bounds. *Des Cartes* first replied himself to the charges brought against him; and afterwards, his disciples afforded him aid. On the other hand, *Voët* was joined, not only by those Dutch theologians who were then in the highest reputation for erudition and soundness in the faith, such as *Andrew Rivet*, *Maresius*, and *Van Mastricht*, but also by the greatest part of the clergy of inferior note.(79) To this flame already raised too high, new fuel was added

(78) See *Fred. Spanheim's* Epistola de novissimis in Belgio dissidiis; Opp., tom. ii., p. 973, &c.

(79) *Hadr. Baillet*, la vie de Mr. Des Cartes, tome ii., cap. v., p. 33, &c. *Gabr. Daniel*, Voyage du Monde de Mr. Des Cartes; in his works, tome i., p. 84, &c. [*Jac. Brucker's* Historia Crit. philosophiæ, tom. iv., part ii., p. 222, &c. *Irenæus Philalethes* (*Jac. Rhenferd*), Kort en opregt Verhaal van de eerste Oorsprong der Broedertwisten, Amsterd., 1708, 8vo. The first attack upon the philosophy of *Des Cartes* was made by *Gisbert Voët*, A.D. 1639, in his Disputatio de Atheismo. *Smauel Maresius*, at first defended the cause of *Des Cartes* against *Voët:*

when some of the theologians applied the precepts of *Des Cartes* to the illustration of theological subjects. Hence in the year 1656, the Dutch *Classes* as they are called, or assemblies of the clergy in certain districts, resolved that resistance ought to be made, and that this imperious philosophy ought not to be allowed to invade the territories of theology. By this decision the States of Holland were excited, in the same year, sternly to forbid by a public law, the philosophers from expounding the books of *Des Cartes* to the youth, or explaining the scriptures according to the dictates of philosophy. In a convention at Delft the next year, it was resolved, that no person should be admitted to the sacred office, without first solemnly promising not to propagate Cartesian principles, nor to deform revealed theology with adventitious ornaments. Similar resolutions were afterwards passed in various places, both in the United Provinces, and out of them.(80) But as mankind are always eager after what is forbidden, all these prohibitions could not prevent the Cartesian philosophy from finally obtaining firm footing in the schools and universities, and from being applied sometimes preposterously, by great numbers, to the illustration of divine truths. Hence the Dutch became divided into the two parties, above named; and the rest of the century was spent amid their perpetual contentions.

§ 31. *John Cocceius*, (in German *Koch*), a native of Bremen, professor of theology in the University of Leyden, and unquestionably a great man, if he had only been able to regulate and to temper with reason and judgment, his erudition, his ingenuity, his reverence for the holy scriptures, and his piety, which he possessed in an eminent degree; introduced into theology not a little that was novel and unheard of before his times. In the first place, as has been already remarked, he interpreted the whole sacred volume in a manner very different from that of *Calvin* and all his followers. For he maintained, that the entire history of the Old Testament, presents a picture of the events that were to take place under the New Testament, down to the end of the world; nay more, that the things which Christ and his apostles did and suffered in this world, were emblematic of future events. He moreover taught, that the greatest part of the prophecies of the Jewish prophets, foretell the fortunes of Christ and of the Christian church, not by means of the persons and things mentioned, [not *typically*], but by the direct import of the words themselves. And lastly, many of those passages in the Old Testament, which seem to contain nothing but the praises of Jehovah, or moral precepts and doctrines, he with wonderful dexterity and ingenuity, converted into sacred enigmas and predictions

but afterwards he went over to the side of his adversaries. Even *Cocceius* was at first opposed to *Des Cartes*, though his friend *Heidan* persuaded him to treat the name of *Des Cartes* respectfully in his writings. *Peter van Mastricht*, *John Hornbeck*, *Andrew Essen*, *Melchior Leydecker*, *John Wayen*, *Gerhard Vries*, *James Revius*, *James Trigland*, and *Frederic Spanheim*—manifestly great names—contended against *Des Cartes*. For him, there were among the philosophers, *Henry Regius*, *James Golius*, *Claudius Salmasius*, *Hadr. Heerebord*, &c., and among the theologians, *Abraham Heidan*, *Christopher Wittich*, *Francis Burmann*, *John Braun*, *John Clauberg*, *Peter Allinga*, *Balth. Becker*, *Stephen Curcellæus*, *Herm. Alex. Roël*, *Ruard Andala*, and others. —*Schl.*]

(80) *Fred. Spanheim*, de novissimis in Belgio dissidiis; Opp., tom. ii., 959, &c. Those who wish it, may also consult the common historians of this century, *Arnold*, (Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, vol. ii., book xvii., ch. x., § 1–6), *Weissmann*, (Historia Eccles. sæc. xvii., p 905), *Jæger*, *Caroli*, and also *Walch's* Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten ausser unsrer Kirche, vol. iii.

of future events. To give support and plausibility to these opinions, he first laid down this law of interpretation, that the language of the Bible *must* signify all that it *can* signify: which rule, if adopted by a man of more genius than judgment, may give birth to very strange interpretations. In the next place, he distributed the entire history of the Christian church into seven portions of time or *periods*, relying principally on the seven trumpets and seals of the Apocalypse.

§ 32. Theology itself, in the opinion of *Cocceius*, ought to be freed from the trammels of philosophy, and to be expounded only in scriptural phraseology. Hence, perceiving that the sacred writers denominate the method of salvation which God has prescribed, a *covenant* of God with men, he concluded that there could be no more suitable and pertinent analogy, according to which to adjust and arrange an entire system of theology. But while intent solely on accommodating and applying the principles of human covenants to divine subjects, he incautiously fell into some opinions which it is not easy to approve. For instance, he asserted that the covenant which God made with the Hebrew nation, through the medium of *Moses*, did not differ in its nature, from the new covenant procured by *Jesus Christ*. He supposed that God caused the ten commandments to be promulged by *Moses*, not as a *law* which was to be obeyed, but as one form of the covenant of *grace*. But when the Hebrews had offended him by various sins, and especially by the worship of the golden calf, God being moved with just indignation, superadded to that moral law the yoke of the ceremonial law, to serve as a punishment. This yoke was in itself very burdensome, but it became much more painful in consequence of its import. For it continually admonished the Hebrews of their very imperfect, doubtful, and anxious state, and was a kind of perpetual memento that they merited the wrath of God, and that they could not anticipate a full expiation and remission of their sins till the Messiah should come. Holy men indeed, under the Old Testament, enjoyed eternal salvation after death; but while they lived, they were far from having that assurance of salvation, which is so comforting to us under the New Testament. For no sins were then actually forgiven, but only suffered to remain unpunished; because *Christ* had not yet offered up himself as a sacrifice to God, and therefore could not be regarded, before the divine tribunal, as one who has actually assumed our debt, but only as our surety. I omit other opinions of *Cocceius*. Those who assailed the Cartesian doctrines, attacked also these opinions, in a fierce war which was kept up for many years, with various success. The issue was the same as in the Cartesian contest. No device and no force could prevent the disciples of *Cocceius* from occupying many professorial chairs, and from propagating the opinions of their master both orally and in writing, with wonderful celerity among even the Germans and the Swiss.(81)

§ 33. Nearly all the other controversies which disquieted the Dutch churches in this century, arose from an excessive attachment to the Cartesian philosophy as connected with theology. This will appear from those commotions greater than all others, produced by *Roël* and *Becker*. Cer-

(81) The same writers may be consulted here, as were referred to in § 30, [note 79]; for the Cartesian and Cocceian controversies were united in one. To these may be added, *Val. Alberti*, Διπλοῦν κάππα. Cartesianismus et Cocceianismus, descripti et refutati, Leips., 1678, 4to.

tain Cartesian divines, at the head of whom was *Herman Alexander Roël*, a theologian of Franeker, a man of singular acuteness and perspicuity, were supposed in the year 1686, to attribute too much to reason in theology. Nearly the whole controversy was embraced in these two questions. I. Whether the divine origin and authority of the sacred books, can be demonstrated by reason alone; or whether the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit is necessary, in order to a firm belief on this subject? II. Whether the Holy Scriptures propose any thing to be believed by us, which is contrary to correct and sound reason? The first was affirmed and the second denied, not only by the above named *Roël*, but also by *John van der Wayen*, *Gisbert Wessel*, *Duker*, *Ruard ab Andala*, and others: the contrary was maintained, by *Ulrich Huber*, a jurist of great reputation, *Gerhard de Vries*, and others.(82) A great part of Belgium being now in a flame, the states of Friesland prudently interposed and enjoined silence and peace on both the contending parties. Those who shall accurately investigate this cause, will I think perceive, that a great part of it was a strife about words, and that the remainder of it might have been easily settled if it had been stripped of its ambiguities.

§ 34. A little after this first controversy had been in some measure hushed, this same *Roël* in the year 1689, fell under no slight suspicion that he was plotting against sound theology, in consequence of some other singular opinions of his. He was viewed with suspicion, not only by his colleagues, particularly by *Campeius Vitringa*, but also by very many of the Dutch divines.(83) For he denied that the Scriptural representations of the generation of the Son of God, are to be understood literally or as denoting a kind of natural generation; and maintained that the death of holy men and the evils they suffer in this life, equally with the calamities and death of the wicked, are the penal effects of the first sin; and he advanced some things respecting the divine decrees, original sin, the divine influence in regard to the sinful acts of men, the satisfaction made by Christ, and other subjects, which either in reality, or at least in form and phraseology, differed much from the received opinions.(84) The magistrates of Friesland published decrees, which prevented these disputes from spreading in that province: but the rest of the Dutch, and especially those of the province of Holland, could not be restrained from condemning *Roël* and his disciples, both privately and in their public conventions, as corrupters of divine truth.(85) Nor did this resentment die with the excellent

(82) *John le Clerc*, Biblioth. Universelle et Histor., tome vi., p. 368.

(83) Concerning this extraordinary man, see the Bibliotheca Bremensis Theologico-Philol., tom. ii., pt. vi., p. 707. *Caspar Burmann's* Trajectum eruditum, p. 306, &c. [Unpartheyische Kirchenhistorie, Jena, 1735, 4to, vol. ii, p. 620, &c.—*Tr.*]

(84) These errors may be best learned from a paper of the *Faculty of Theology at Leyden*, in which they confirm the sentence pronounced on them by the Dutch synods, entitled: Judicium ecclesiasticum, quo opiniones quædam Cl. H. A. Roëllii synodice damnatæ sunt, laudatum a Professoribus Theologiæ in Academia Lugduno-Batava; Leyden, 1713, 4to, 20 sheets. [*Roël* maintained, that the title *Son of God* referred only to the human nature of Christ, and to the supernatural formation or conception of it, as also to his mediatorial office; and consequently, that it afforded no proof of his divinity. Yet in his later writings, he admitted that Christ was also called the Son of God, on account of his eternal generation by the Father; yet without excluding the before mentioned ground. In order to prove that the death of believers is a punishment, he maintained, that in justification only *some* of the punishments of sin are remitted, and that the complete removal of them does not take place till after the resurrection.—*Schl.*]

(85) [It must not be inferred, from this statement of *Dr. Mosheim*, that professor

man who was the object of it; but even to our times, the *Roëlians*, though they most solemnly protest their innocence, are thought by many to be infected with concealed heresies.

§ 35. *Balthazar Becker*, a minister of the Gospel at Amsterdam, from the Cartesian definition of a spirit, the truth of which he held to be unquestionable, took occasion to deny absolutely all that the Scriptures teach us respecting the works, snares, and power of the prince of darkness and his satellites, and also all the vulgar reports respecting ghosts, spectres, and witchcraft. There is extant a prolix and copious work of his, entitled *The World Bewitched*, first published in 1691; in which he perverts and explains away, with no little ingenuity indeed, but with no less audacity, whatever the sacred volume relates of persons possessed by evil spirits, and of the power of demons; and maintains, that the miserable being whom the sacred writers call *Satan* and the *Devil*, together with his ministers, lies bound with everlasting chains in hell; so that he cannot thence go forth to terrify mortals, and to plot against the righteous. *Des Cartes* placed the essence of spirit in *thinking:* but none of those acts which are ascribed to evil spirits, can be effected by mere *thought*.(86) Therefore lest the reputation of *Des Cartes* should be impaired, the narrations and decisions of the divine books must be accommodated to his opinion. This error not only disquieted all the United Provinces, but likewise induced not a few Lutheran divines to gird on their armour.(87) Its author, although

Röel was excommunicated, deprived of his office, or even declared a heretic. Some of his *opinions* were condemned; but not the *man*. After serving as a chaplain to several noblemen, he was made professor, first of philosophy and then of theology, at Franeker in Friesland, in the year 1686. In the year 1704, he was removed to the professorship of theology at Utrecht; where he died in office, A.D. 1718, aged 65. The states of Friesland enjoined upon him in 1691, not to teach or preach his peculiarities of sentiment; they also enjoined upon his opposers, to keep silence on the same subjects. Both obeyed: so that in Friesland, there was no more contention. But in the other Dutch provinces, no such order was taken by the government: and therefore several synods, finding *Roël's* opinions to exist and to spread, passed orders of condemnation upon them; and decreed that candidates should be required to renounce them, in order to their receiving license. He was undoubtedly a great man. Hence *Mosheim* calls him vir eximius. He was also in the main, sound in the faith. Yet on some points, he carried his speculations farther than the spirit of the times would permit. But like a good man, when he found his speculations to produce alarm and commotion, at the bidding of the magistrates, he forbore to urge them and expended his efforts on subjects less offensive.—*Tr.*]

(86) ["Our historian relates here, somewhat obscurely, the reasoning which Becker founded upon the Cartesian definition of mind or spirit. The tenour and amount of his argument is as follows: 'The essence of mind is *thought*, and the essence of matter is *extension*.—Now since there is no sort of conformity or connexion between a *thought* and *extension*, mind cannot act upon matter unless these two substances be united, as soul and body are in man:—therefore no separate spirits, either good or evil, can act upon mankind. Such acting is miraculous, and miracles can be performed by God alone. It follows of consequence, that the Scripture accounts of the actions and operations of good and evil spirits must be understood in an allegorical sense.'—This is *Becker's* argument; and it does, in truth, little honour to his acuteness and sagacity. By proving too much, it proves nothing at all; for if the want of a connexion or conformity between thought and extension renders mind incapable of acting upon matter, it is hard to see how their union should remove this incapacity, since the want of conformity and connexion remains notwithstanding this union. Besides, according to this reasoning, the Supreme Being cannot act upon material beings. In vain does *Becker* maintain the affirmative, by having recourse to a miracle, for this would imply, that the whole course of nature was a series of miracles, that is to say, that there are no miracles at all."—*Macl.*]

(87) See *Michael Lilienthal's* Selecta Histor. Litterar., pt. i., observ. ii., p. 17, &c. Miscellanea Lipsiens., tom. i., p. 361,

confuted by vast numbers, and deprived of his ministerial office, yet on his dying bed in 1718, continued to affirm until his last breath, that he believed all he had written to be true. Nor did his new doctrine die with him; but it still has very many defenders, both open and concealed.

§ 36. It is well known that various sects, some of them Christian, others semi-Christian, and others manifestly delirious, not unfrequently start up and are cherished in Holland as well as England. But it is not easy for any one who does not reside in those countries, to give a correct account of them; because the books which contain the necessary information, seldom find their way into foreign countries. Yet the Dutch sects of *Verschorists* and *Hattemists*, having now for some time been better known among us, I shall here give some account of them. The former derived their name from *James Verschoor* of Flushing; who is said to have so

364, where there is a description of a medal struck in reference to Becker; and the other writers, whom we have often quoted. Nouveau Diction. Hist. et Crit, tome i., p. 193. [*Balthazar Becker*, D.D., was born near Groningen in 1634; educated there and at Franeker; made rector of the Latin school in the latter place, a preacher, a doctor of divinity; and lastly, a pastor at Amsterdam, where he died in 1718. This learned man, published three Catechisms; in the last of which, 1670, he taught that Adam, if he had not sinned, would have been immortal, by virtue of the fruits of the tree of life; questioned, whether endless punishment, (which he placed in horror and despair), was consistent with the goodness of God; and admitted Episcopacy to be the most ancient and customary form of church government. These sentiments exposed him to some animadversion. In 1680, he published a book, in proof that *comets* are not ominous. In his sermons, he had often intimated that too much was ascribed to the agency of the devil: and being frequently questioned on the subject, he concluded to give the world his full views on the whole subject. This he did in his Dutch work, entitled: *Betoverde Wereld*, &c., i. e, The World Bewitched, or a critical investigation of the commonly received opinion respecting spirits, their nature, power, and acts, and all those extraordinary feats, which men are said to perform, through their aid; in 4 Books, Amsterd., 1691, 4to. In the preface, he says: "It is come to that, at the present day, that it is almost regarded as a part of religion, to ascribe great wonders to the devil; and those are taxed with infidelity and perverseness, who hesitate to believe, what thousands relate, concerning his power. It is now thought essential to piety, not only to fear God, but also to fear the devil. Whoever does not do so, is accounted an atheist; because he cannot persuade himself, that there are two Gods, the one good, and the other evil." He also gives a challenge to the devil: "If he is a God, let him defend himself: let him lay hold of me; for I throw down his altars. In the name of the God of hosts, I fight with this Goliath: we will see, who can deliver him." In the *first* Book, he states the opinions of the pagans, concerning gods, spirits, and demons; and shows, that both Jews and Christians have derived their prejudices on this subject, from them. In the *second*, he shows, what reason and scripture teach concerning spirits: and in the *third*, confutes the believers in witchcraft and confederacies with the devil. In the *fourth* Book he answers the arguments alleged from experience, to prove the great power of the devil. He founds his doctrine on two grand principles; that from their very nature, spirits cannot act upon material beings; and that the scriptures represent the devil and his satellites, as shut up in the prison of hell. To explain away the texts which militate against his system, evidently cost him much labour and perplexity. His interpretations, for the most part, are similar to those still relied on, by the believers in his doctrine.—*Becker* was not the first writer, who published such opinions. Before him were, *Arnold Geulinx* of Leyden, who died in 1669; and *Daillon*, a French Reformed preacher, who fled to London, and there published his views in 1687. But these advanced their opinions problematically; while *Becker* advanced his, in a positive tone. He also discussed the whole subject; and he mingled wit and sarcasm, with his arguments. This difference caused his book to awaken very great attention; while theirs passed unheeded. *Becker* was deposed and silenced, by the synods of Edam and Alkmaar, in 1692. But the senate of Amsterdam continued to him his salary, till his death in 1718. See *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, vol. viii., p. 713, &c.—*Tr.*]

strangely mixed together the principles of *Spinoza* and *Coccceius*, as out of them to have produced about the year 1680, a new system of religion, which was quite absurd and impious. His followers are also called *Hebrews;* because they all, both men and women, bestow great attention on the Hebrew language. The latter sect arose about the same time, and had for their leader *Pontianus van Hattem*, a minister of the Gospel at Philipsland in Zealand, who was an admirer of *Spinoza*, and was afterwards deprived of his office on account of his errors. These two sects were kindred to each other: and yet they must have differed in some way; since *Van Hattem* could never persuade the *Verschorists* to enter into alliance with him. Neither of them wished to be looked upon as abandoning the Reformed religion; and *Hattem* wrote an exposition of the *Heidelberg Catechism*. If I understand correctly the not very lucid accounts given us of their doctrines, the founders of both sects in the first place, inferred from the Reformed doctrine of the absolute decrees of God, this principle, that whatever takes place, necessarily and unavoidably takes place. Assuming this as true, they denied that men are by nature wicked or corrupt; and that human actions are some of them good, and others bad. Hence they concluded, that men need not trouble themselves about a change of heart, nor be solicitous to obey the divine law; that religion does not consist in *acting*, but in *suffering;* and that Jesus Christ inculcated this only, that we patiently and cheerfully endure whatever by the good pleasure of God occurs, or befalls us, striving only to keep our minds tranquil. *Hattem* in particular, taught that Jesus Christ did not by his death appease divine justice, nor expiate the sins of men; but that he signified to us, there was nothing in us that could offend God, and in this way he made us just. These things appear to be perverse, and inimical to all virtue: and yet neither of these men—unless I am wholly deceived—was so beside himself, as to recommend iniquity, or to suppose that a person may safely follow his lusts. At least, the sentiment ascribed to them, that *God punishes men* BY *their sins, not* FOR *them*, seems to carry this import, that unless a person bridles his lusts, he must suffer punishment both in this life and in that to come; yet not by a divine infliction, or by the sovereign will and pleasure of God, but by some law of nature.(88) Both sects still exist; but they have discarded the names derived from their founders.

§ 37. The churches of Switzerland from the year 1669, were in great fear lest the religion handed down to them by their fathers and confirmed at the synod of Dort, should be contaminated with the doctrines already mentioned of the French divines, *Amyraut*, *De la Placè*, and *Capell*. For there were at that time, among the associated ministers of Geneva, certain men distinguished both for their eloquence and their erudition, who not only approved those doctrines, but endeavoured against the will of their colleagues to induce others to embrace them.(89) To restrain the efforts of these men, the principal divines of Switzerland in the year 1675, had a book drawn up by *John Henry Heidegger*, a very celebrated divine of Zurich, in opposition to the new doctrines of the Frenchmen; and with no great difficulty, they persuaded the magistrates to annex it by public au-

(88) See *Theodore Hasæus*, Dissert. in the Museum Bremens. Theol. Philol., vol. ii., p. 144, &c. *Wilhelm Goeree*, Kerkelyke and wereldlycke Historie, Leyden, 1729, 4to. Bibliotheque Belgique, tome ii., p. 203, &c.

(89) See *Greg. Leti's* Istoria Genevrina, part iv., lib. v., p. 448, 488, 497, &c.

thority, to the common Helvetic formulas of religion. It is usually called the *Formula Consensus*. But this measure which was intended to secure peace, became rather the fruitful source of contentions and disturbance. For many declared, that they could not conscientiously assent to this *Formula:* and hence pernicious commotions arose in several places. In consequence of these, the canton of Basle and the republic of Geneva, at the urgent solicitation of *Frederic William* of Brandenburg, in the year 1686, abrogated the Formula Consensus.(90) In the other cantons, it with difficulty retained its authority for some time; but in our age, having given birth to the most violent quarrels, particularly in the university of Lausanne, it began to sink also in these cantons, and to lose nearly all its influence.(91)

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THE ARMINIANS OR REMONSTRANTS.

§ 1. The Name of Arminians.—§ 2. Their Origin.—§ 3. Their Progress.—§ 4. The Five Points.—§ 5, 6. Maurice resolves on their Destruction.—§ 7. Opinion of the Synod of Dort.—§ 8. Condition after the Synod of Dort.—§ 9. Recalled from Exile.—§ 10. Early and later Theology of the Arminians.—§ 11. Its Aim, and principal Heads.—§ 12. Their Confession of Faith.—§ 13. Present State of the Arminians.

§ 1. From the bosom of the Reformed church, to its great injury, there originated in the present century two sects, the *Arminians* and the *Qua-*

(90) ["It must not be imagined, from this expression of our historian, that this *Form*, entitled the *Consensus*, was abrogated at Basil by a positive edict. The case stood thus: Mr. *Peter Werenfels*, who was at the head of the Consistory of that city, paid such regard to the letter of the Elector, as to avoid requiring a subscription to this Form from the candidates for the ministry, and his conduct, in this respect, was imitated by his successors. The remonstrances of the Elector do not seem to have had the same effect upon those that governed the church of Geneva; for the *Consensus*, or *Form of Agreement*, maintained its credit and authority there until the year 1706, when, without being abrogated by any positive act, it fell into disuse. In several other parts of Switzerland, it was still imposed as a rule of faith, as appears by the letters addressed by *George* I. king of England, as also by the king of Prussia, in the year 1723, to the Swiss Cantons, in order to procure the abrogation of this *Form*, or *Consensus*, which was considered as an obstacle to the union of the Reformed and Lutheran churches. See the Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire des troubles arrivées en Suisse à l'occasion du Consensus; published in 8vo, at Amsterdam, in the year 1726."—*Macl.*]

(91) See *Christ. Matth. Pfaff's* Schediasma de formula consensus Helvetica: Tubing., 1723, 4to. Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire des troubles arrivées en Suisse à l'occasion du Consensus; Amsterd., 1726, 8vo. [In this *Formula Consensus*, (which, like the Lutheran *Formula Concordiæ*, might better be called *Formula Dissensus*), four controversies, which had previously disquieted the Reformed churches, were decided. It condemned, I. the doctrine of *Moses Amyraut*, respecting general grace; and established the most strenuous opinion of special grace. It condemned, II. the opinion of *Joshua Placæus* (*De la Placè*) respecting the imputation of Adam's sin:—III. *Piscator's* doctrine, concerning the active obedience of Christ: and IV. *Lewis Capell's* critical doctrine, concerning the points of the Hebrew text. This Formula, so long as subscription to it was rigorously enforced, deprived the Swiss churches of many a worthy divine, who would rather quit his country, than violate his conscience. *Sulzer* of Berlin, was a remarkable example.—*Schl.*]

kers; the former owing its birth to an excessive regard for human reason, and the latter to a neglect of it. The *Arminians* derived their name and their rise from *James Harmensen*, or as he chose to be called in Latin, *James Arminius;* first a minister of the Gospel at Amsterdam, and then professor of theology at Leyden; a man whom even his enemies commend for his ingenuity, acuteness, and piety.(1) They are also called *Remonstrants*, from the petition they presented to the states of Holland and West Friesland in 1610, which was entitled a *Remonstrance*. And as the friends of Calvinism presented another petition in opposition to this, under the title of *Counter Remonstrance*, they obtained the name of *Contra-Remonstrants*.

§ 2. *Arminius*, though trained from infancy in the Genevan doctrines, and actually educated in the academy of Geneva, when he arrived at manhood, abandoned the common doctrine of the majority in the Reformed church respecting predestination and the divine decrees, and went over to the side of those who believe that the love of God and the merits of our Saviour respect the whole human race.(2) Time and reflection confirmed him in his sentiments; and when called to the office of a professor at Leyden, he thought duty and candour required him publicly to teach his sentiments, and to oppose the opinions of *Calvin*, which were embraced by most of the Dutch divines. And this he was the more bold to do, because he knew that many persons besides himself, and some of them men of the highest respectability, were averse from the Genevan opinions on this subject; neither were the teachers required, either by the *Belgic Confession* or by any other public law, to think and teach just as *Calvin* did. *Arminius* inculcated what he deemed true, not without effect; for he persuaded great numbers to adopt his sentiments. But at the same time, he drew on himself immense odium from the Calvinistic school, which then flourished greatly in Holland. In particular, *Francis Gomar* his colleague,

(1) The fullest account given of him, is by *Caspar Brandt*, in his Historia vitæ Jac. Arminii, Leyden, 1724, 8vo, and republished. with a preface and some notes, by me; Brunswick, 1725, 8vo. Add the Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. et Crit., tome i., p. 471, &c., [and, The Creed of Arminius, with a brief sketch of his life and times, by *M. Stuart;* in the Biblical Repertory, Andover, 1831, vol. i., No. ii., p. 226–308.—*Tr.*] The entire works of *Arminius* have been repeatedly published, in a moderate sized 4to volume. I use the edition of Frankfort, 1634, 4to. Those who wish to discover and estimate correctly the genius of the man, should read especially the *Disputationes*, both the public and the private. His manner of teaching partakes somewhat of the dark scholasticism of his age; and yet it approximates to that simplicity and perspicuity, which his followers have regarded and still regard as among the primary excellences of a theologian. The historians of the sect and its Confessions, are treated of, by *Jo. Christ. Köcher*. Biblioth. Theol. Symbolicæ, p. 481, &c. [See also *G. S. Francke's* Diss. Theologica de Historia dogmatum Arminianorum; Keil, 1813, 8vo.—*Tr.* Among their *Confessions*, may be reckoned, I. Their *Remonstrance*, in 1610; which was presented to the States in vindication of *Arminius* and other divines accused of error; and was first printed in 1617.—II. Their proper *Confession*, of 1621, which *Saml. Episcopius* set forth.—III. Their *Apology*, in 1629, in reply to the confutation of their Confession by the Leyden divines; set forth also by *Episcopius*.—IV. Their *Catechism* of 1640, by *Jo. Uytenbogærd*. V. Lastly, their Acta et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena, Harderwyck, (or rather, printed on board a ship), 1620, 4to. These are very different from the Acta Synodi Dordr. published at Dort in folio.—*Schl.*]

(2) The occasion of this change is treated of, by *Peter Bertius*, Oratio in funus Arminii; by *Caspar Brandt*, Vita Arminii, p. 22, and by nearly all the historians of these events. The change took place in 1591; as appears from the famous letter of *Arminius* to *Grynæus*, written in this year, (and extant in the Biblioth. Bremensis Theol Philologica, tom. iii., p. 384), for he there states his doubts.

was very hostile to him. Such was the commencement of the long and most unpleasant controversy. But *Arminius* died in 1609, just as it began to rage and pervade the whole United Provinces.(3)

§ 3. After the death of *Arminius*, the controversy was carried on for several years, without any decisive advantage gained by either party. The wishes of the Arminians, who sought only to have their opinions tolerated in the state or republic, were not a little favoured by the first men in the commonwealth, such as *John van Oldenbarnevelt*, *Hugo Grotius*, *Rombout Hoogerbeets*, and others. For these supposed, that in their free country, every one might believe what he chose on subjects not determined by the *Belgic Confession;* and they used every means to bring the Calvinists to bear with moderation, the dissent of the opposite party. And even prince *Maurice* of Orange, the head of the commonwealth, and who afterwards became the capital enemy of the Arminians, together with his mother and the court, was at first not averse from these views. Hence the conference between the parties at the Hague in 1611; hence also the discussion at Delft in 1613; and likewise the edict of the States of Holland in 1614, in favour of peace; and all the other efforts to reconcile the brethren whom religion had separated from each other.(4) But the suspicion of the Calvinists that the Arminians aimed at the overthrow of all religion, was so far from being allayed by these measures, that it daily became more confirmed; and they spiritedly censured the zeal of the magistrates, for interposing their authority in behalf of public peace.(5) And whoever regards truth more than every other consideration, must acknowledge, that the Arminians were not sufficiently cautious, in regard to their intercourse and familiarity with persons disposed to advance opinions very wide from the Reformed religion; and in this way, they gave great occasion to their adversaries to suspect them of every thing bad and pernicious to the public religion.

§ 4. The whole controversy however, which after the council at Dort

(3) No one has more copiously treated the whole history of the controversy, and the public schism that arose from it, than *Gerhard Brandt*, in his excellent work, The History of the Reformation in Belgium, written in Dutch, volumes ii. and iii.; of which there are extant concise epitomes, both in English and in French. To this may be added *Jo. Uytenbogærd's* Ecclesiastical History [of the United provinces, 1647, fol.] also written in Dutch; *Phil. Limborch's* Historia vitæ Episcopii; and the Epistolæ clarorum virorum, (commonly called, Epistolæ Arminianorum), published by *Limborch.* Such as wish for a shorter narrative, may consult *Phil. Limborch's* Relatio Historica de origine et progressu controversiarum in fœderato Belgio de prædestinatione et capitibus annexis; which is subjoined to the later editions of his Theologia Christiana. But all these were Arminians. Such as think proper to hear also the contrary party, may consult *Jac. Trigland's* Ecclesiastical History, written in Dutch; and some likewise of the numerous writings which have been published against the Remonstrants.

(4) The authors who treat particularly of these events, are mentioned by the writers of the general history: and we therefore omit to name them. Yet *Michael le Vassor*, who in the 1st and 2d volumes of his Histoire de Louis XIII. has particularly treated of these troubles, deserves especially to be read. [But still more, *Van Wagenaer*, History of the United Netherlands, vol. iv., p. 311, &c., of the German translation.—*Schl.*]

(5) The conduct of the magistrates, who sought to quiet the commotions by their interposition, and who employed not only persuasion but likewise commands, was eloquently and learnedly defended by *Hugo Grotius*, in two treatises. The one, which is in every body's hands and has been often printed, is a general treatise, entitled: De jure summarum potestatum circa sacra: the other descends to particulars, and is entitled: Ordinum Hollandiæ et Westfrisiæ pietas a multorum calumniis vindicata, Lugd. Bat. 1613, 4to.

assumed a very different form, and was enlarged by many additions, was at this time confined to the doctrines of grace and predestination; and was comprehended by the Remonstrants, in the five propositions which are so well known under the name of the *Five Points*. For the Arminians taught:—I. That before the foundation of the world or from eternity, God decreed to bestow eternal salvation, on those who, he foresaw, would maintain their faith in Christ Jesus inviolate until death; and on the other hand, to consign over to eternal punishment the unbelieving, who resist the invitations of God to the end of their lives.—II. That Jesus Christ, by his death, made expiation for the sins of all and every one of mankind: yet that none but believers, can become partakers of this divine benefit.—III. That no one can of himself, or by the powers of his free will, produce or generate faith in his own mind; but that man, being by nature evil and incompetent (ineptus) both to think and to do good, it is necessary he should be born again and renewed by God for Christ's sake, through the Holy Spirit.—IV. That this divine grace or energy, which heals the soul of man, commences, advances and perfects all that can be called truly good in man: and therefore, all the good works [of men] are ascribable to no one except to God only, and to his grace: yet that this grace compels no man, against his will; though it may be repelled, by his perverse will.—V. That those, who are united to Christ by faith, are furnished with sufficient strength to overcome the snares of the devil, and the allurements of sin: but whether they can fall from this state of grace and lose their faith, or not, does not yet sufficiently appear, and must be ascertained by a careful examination of the holy scriptures. The last of these propositions, the Arminians afterwards so modified, as to assert explicitly, that it *is* possible a man should lose his faith and fall from a state of grace.(6) At that time therefore, if we may judge of men's meaning by their statements and declarations, the Arminians very much resembled the Lutherans. The Calvanists however maintain, that the opinions of the Arminians are not to be learned from their declarations, but that their language must be interpreted by their secret sentiments; for they assert, that the Arminians under these specious representations, instilled the poison of Socinianism and Pelagianism into honest and unsuspicious minds. God is the judge of men's hearts: yet if it were allowable to estimate the import of these propositions, by what the leading men of the sect have taught more recently, it would be very difficult wholly to disprove that judgment of the Calvinists. For whatever the Arminians may say, the doctrines taught since the synod of Dort by their principal doctors, respecting grace and the points connected with it, approach much nearer to the sentiments of those called Pelagians, and Semipelagians, than to those professed by the Lutherans.

§ 5. The Arminians, supported by the friendship of the magistrates, viewed their cause as safe, or at least as not desperate, when suddenly an unexpected storm entirely prostrated it. There arose first concealed ill-will, and afterwards hostility between the principal administrators of the new Belgic republic. On the one part, were *John van Oldenbarnevelt*, a very

(6) The history of these *Five Articles* especially among the English, was written by *Peter Heylin*, and translated from English into Dutch by *Gerhard Brandt*, and published at Roterdam in 1687, 8vo. [These Articles were exhibited by the Remonstrants, in the conference at the Hague in the year 1611, or two years after the death of *Arminius*.—*Tr.*]

distinguished man, *Hugo Grotius* and *Rombout Hoogerbeets;* and on the other, the stadtholder, *Maurice* prince of Orange. According to some authors, *Maurice* wished to be created count of Holland;—a design, which his father *William*, had before entertained:(7) according to others, he only wished to obtain more authority and power than appeared consistent with the liberties of the state: at least, (as no one denies), he was regarded by the leading men, as seeking supreme dominion with the subversion of liberty. The head men of the republic, whom we have mentioned and who were also patrons of the Arminians, resisted these designs. The Remonstrants strenuously supported their defenders, without whom they could not remain in safety; and on the other hand, their adversaries accommodated themselves to the views and wishes of the prince, and inflamed his already irritated mind by various new suspicions. He therefore kindling with indignation, resolved on the destruction of those who guided the commonwealth with their counsels, and of the Arminians who were their supporters, and at the same time, joined himself to the party of the Calvinists. Those leading men in the republic, above mentioned, were therefore thrown into prison. *Oldenbarnevelt*, a man of great respectability and venerable both for his gray hairs and for his long and faithful public services, was consigned to a capital punishment. *Grotius* and *Hoogerbeets* were condemned to perpetual imprisonment;(8) under I know not what

(7) That *Maurice* aimed at the dignity of count of Holland, is stated by *Lewis Aubery*, from the representations of his father *Benjamin du Maurier*, the French ambassador to Holland; in his Mém. pour serv. à l'Hist. de Hollande et des autres provinces unies, sect. ii., p. 216, ed. Paris, 1697, 8vo. According to *Aubery*, *Oldenbarnevelt* disapproved and resisted this design of the prince; and *Maurice* revenged this temerity, by the capital punishment of this great patriot. The truth of this statement is opposed at great length, by *Mich. le Vassor*, in his Histoire de Louis XIII., tome ii., pt. ii., p. 123, &c. But *John le Clerc*, in his Biblioth. Choisie, tome ii., p. 134, &c., and in his Historia provinciarum Belgii fœderati, takes great pains to substantiate the truth of this statement of *Aubery*, or rather of *Aubery's* father; and he also shows, that *Maurice's* father had the same designs. It is not necessary we should decide this dispute. It is sufficient for our purpose, that *Maurice* was viewed by *Oldenbarnevelt* and his friends, as wishing to subvert the liberties of his country and to obtain supreme power; (which no one denies); and that this was the cause of *Oldenbarnevelt's* eagerness to weaken the influence of *Maurice*, and to check the progress of his power; whence arose the indignation of *Maurice*, and the calamities of the Arminians who adhered to *Oldenbarnevelt* and *Grotius*.

(8) That the general course of events was such as is here stated, will not be denied at the present day when the times of excitement have gone by, even by the patrons of Calvinistic sentiments who are ingenuous. And they may grant this, without injury to their cause. For if their ancestors, (though I wish neither to deny nor to affirm the fact), while guarding and defending their religious opinions, either from the customs of the age or from the ebullitions of passion, were not so considerate and provident as they should have been; no candid and wise man will thence infer, that these their sons are bad men, or their cause an iniquitous one. Because it is well known, that many bad things are often done by men by no means bad, and that a good cause is often defended in an unjustifiable manner. For illustration and confirmation of the facts here concisely stated, the best authorities in addition to those already mentioned, are *John le Clerc*, in his Historia provinciarum Belgii fœderati, and his Bibliotheque Choisie, tome ii., p. 134, &c., and *Hugo Grotius*, in his Apologeticum eorum, qui Hollandiæ, Westfrisiæque et vicinis quibusdam nationibus ex legibus præfuerunt ante mutationem quæ evenit, A.D. 1618, Paris, 1640, 12mo, and often republished. The Life of *John van Oldenbarnevelt*, written in Dutch, was printed at the Hague, 1648, 4to. A history of the trial of the three celebrated Dutchmen above named, was elegantly compiled from authentic documents, by *Gerhard Brandt*, entitled: Historie van de Rechtspleginge gehouden in den Jaaren, 1618 et 1619, omtrent de drie gevangene Heeren Johann van Oldenbarneveld, Rombout Hoogerbeets, Hugo de Groot; of

pretence.(9) The cause of the Arminians could not be brought before a civil tribunal, because their alleged offence was not against the laws but the religion of the country. To procure their condemnation therefore, a more sacred tribunal or a council, must be called; agreeably to the practice of the Genevans, who think all spiritual matters and controversies should be decided in ecclesiastical councils.

§ 6. Without delay, at the instance of *Maurice*,(10) delegates were assembled at Dort a city in Holland, from the United Provinces and from Hesse, England, the Palatinate, Bremen, and Switzerland; who held in the years 1618 and 1619, what is called the Synod of Dort. Before it appeared on citation in defence of their cause, the leading men of the Arminian sect; at the head of whom and their chief orator, was *Simon Episcopius*, a disciple of *Arminius*, and professor of theology at Leyden; a man distinguished, as his enemies admit, for acuteness, learning, and fluency. But scarcely had *Episcopius* saluted the judges in a grave and eloquent address, when difficulties arose embarrassing the whole impending discussion. The Arminians wished to commence the defence of their

which I have before me the third edition, with notes, Rotterdam, 1723, 4to. This whole subject receives also much light from the History of the life and actions of Hugo Grotius, very carefully compiled, chiefly from unpublished papers, by *Caspar Brandt* and *Adrian Cattenburg*. This great and noble work was published in two large volumes, entitled: Historie van het Leven des Heeren *Huig de Groot* beschreven tot den Anfang van zyn Gesandschap wegens de Koninginne en Kroone van Zweden aan't Hof van Vranckryck, door *Casp. Brandt*, en vervolgt tot zyn Doodt door *Adrian van Cattenburgh*; Dordrecht en Amsterd., 1727, 2 vols. fol. Those who wish to get a near view and full knowledge of this great man, must by all means consult this work. For all the other accounts of his life that are extant, are insipid and unanimated, presenting only a shadow of this great hero. Nor is the most recent Life of Grotius in French, by *Burigny*, (republished from the Paris edition, in Holland, 1753, 2 vols. 8vo), much better: at least, it does not satisfy one who is desirous of a thorough knowledge of the transactions. [" There appeared in Holland a warm vindication of the memory of this great man, in a work published at Delft, in 1727, and entitled: Grotii Manes ab iniquis obtrectationibus vindicati; accedit scriptorum ejus, tum editorum tum ineditorum, Conspectus Triplex. See the following note."—*Macl.*]

(9) [" *Dr. Mosheim*, however impartial, seems to have consulted more the authors of one side than of the other; probably because they are more numerous and more universally known. When he published this history, the world was not favoured with the Letters, Memoirs, and Negotiations of Sir *Dudley Carleton*; which lord *Royston* (now earl of *Hardwick*) drew forth some years ago from his inestimable treasure of historical manuscripts, and presented to the public, or rather at first to a select number of persons, to whom he distributed a small number of copies of these *Negotiations*, printed at his own expense. They were soon translated both into Dutch and French; and, though it cannot be affirmed, that the spirit of party is no where discoverable in them, yet they contain anecdotes with respect both to *Oldenbarneveldt* and *Grotius*, that the Arminians and the other patrons of these two great men have been studious to conceal. These anecdotes, though they may not be at all sufficient to justify the severities exercised against these eminent men, would, however, have prevented *Dr. Mosheim* from saying, that he knew not under what pretext they were arrested."—*Macl. Mosheim's* Latin, is: criminum nescio quorum nomine; which *Schlegel* here understands to mean, *upon some unimportant charges*.—*Tr.*]

(10) [" Our author always forgets to mention the *order issued out by the States-General*, for the convocation of this famous synod; and by his manner of expressing himself, and particularly by the phrase, *Mauritio auctore*, would seem to insinuate, that it was by the *prince* that this assembly was called together.—The legitimacy of the manner of convoking this synod was questioned by *Oldenbarneveldt*, who maintained that the *States-General* had no sort of authority in matters of religion, not even the power of assembling a synod; affirming that this was an act of *sovereignty*, that belonged to each province separately and respectively. See *Carleton's* Letters, &c."—*Macl.*]

cause, by attacking the sentiments of their adversaries the Calvinists: this the judges disapproved, deciding that the accused must first explain and prove their own doctrines, before they proceeded to confute those who differed from them. Perhaps the Arminians hoped, that a full exposure of the odious consequences they could attach to the Calvinistic doctrine, would enkindle in the minds of the people present, a hatred of it; while the Calvinists feared, lest the mighty genius and fine eloquence of *Episcopius*, might injure their cause in the view of the multitude.(11) As the Arminians could by no means be persuaded to comply with the wishes of the synod, they were dismissed from the council; and they complained, that they had been treated unjustly. But the judges, after examining their published writings, pronounced them, though absent and unheard, guilty of corrupting theology and holding pestilential errors: and it was coincident with this sentence, that they should be excluded from the communion of the church, and be deprived of authority to teach. That there was fault on both sides in this matter, no candid and good man will deny: but which party was most in the wrong, this is not the place to decide.(12)

§ 7. We cannot here discuss either the purity and virtues, or the iniquities and faults of the fathers at Dort. In extolling the former, the Calvinists, and in exaggerating the latter, the Arminians,—if I do not misjudge,—are over-zealous and active.(13) That among the judges of the Arminians, there were men who were not only learned but also honest and religious, who acted in great sincerity, and who had no suspicion that they were doing any thing wrong, is not to be doubted at all. On

(11) [Perhaps also, another reason why both parties were so stiff on this point, was, that the members of the synod were not themselves of one mind, in regard to the doctrine of predestination; for some of them were Supralapsarians, and others Infralapsarians: and in general, the doctrine of reprobation presented so many difficult points, that the members of the synod deemed it advisable to prescribe to the Remonstrants the mode of confutation and defence, and thus to retain in their own hands the direction of the whole discussion; while the Remonstrants hoped, perhaps, that the diversity of opinion among the members of the synod would prove advantageous to them, if they could have liberty to expatiate widely on the doctrine of reprobation, and divide somewhat the votes of their judges. This is the no improbable conjecture of *Van Wagenaer*, in his Geschichte der vereinigten Niederlande, vol. iv., p. 451.—*Schl.*]

(12) The writers on the council of Dort, are enumerated by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Biblioth. Græca, vol. xi., p. 723. The most copious of them all, is *Gerhard Brandt*, in his History of the Reformation in the Netherlands, vol. ii. and iii. But as he was himself an Arminian, with his narration should be compared, the work of *James Leydecker*, in which the purity and integrity of the synod of Dort are vindicated in answer to *Brandt:* Eere van de Nationale Synode van Dordrecht voorgestaan en bevestigd tegen de Beschuldingen van G. Brandt, vol. i., Amsterd., 1705, vol. ii., 1707, 4to. After formally comparing them, I did not find any very enormous errors in *Brandt:* nor do these two writers disagree so much about the facts, as about the causes and import of the facts. *John Hales*, an Englishman who belonged to neither party, has related simply what he saw; and his *Letters* written from the scene of this council, I myself published some time ago, with notes, Hamburg, 1724, 8vo. [He was chaplain to the English ambassador at the Hague, Sir *Dudley Carleton*, and was king *James*' secret envoy, sent to watch the movements of the Synod. His letters, addressed to *Carleton*, were published under the title of the Golden Remains of the ever memorable *John Hales* of Eton College, 1659, 4to. *Dr. Mosheim* translated them into Latin, prefixed a long preface and added some notes.—*Tr.*]

(13) All that the Arminians deemed faulty in this council, they collected in a concise and neatly written book, frequently printed: Nulliteyten, Mishandelinghen, ende onbyllicke Proceduren des nationalen Synodi ghehouden binnen Dordrecht anno 1618, 1619, in't korte ende rouwe afgheworpen, 1619, 4to.

the other hand, these facts were too clear and obvious to escape the sight of any one:—I. That the destruction of the Arminian sect was determined upon, before the council was called;(14) and these fathers were called together, not to inquire whether this sect might be tolerated or not, but to promulge a sentence long before passed, with some becoming formality, with the appearance of justice, and with the consent of the foreign theologians.—II. That the enemies and accusers of the Arminians, were their judges; and that the president of the council, *John Bogermann*,(15) exceeded almost all others in hatred of this sect.—III. That neither the Dutch nor the foreign divines had liberty to decide according to their own pleasure, but were obliged to decide according to the instructions which they brought with them from their princes and magistrates.(16)—IV.

(14) [*Maclaine* says: "This assertion is of too weighty a nature to be advanced without sufficient proof. Our author quotes no authority for it."—*Schlegel* replies: The proofs lie in the whole progress of the events. And a man must be ignorant of the human heart, and wholly unacquainted with the history of ecclesiastical councils, not to draw the natural conclusion, from what preceded the council, that the condemnation of the Arminians was already determined on, before the council was convened at Dort. The election of *Bogermann*, who possessed the soul of an inquisitor, to the presidency of the synod, would lead us to no other conclusion. The assessors of the president, and the scribes of the council, were known to be zealous Contra-Remonstrants. And so early as the year 1617, in the month of July, the Contra-Remonstrants declared at the Hague, "that they regarded the Remonstrants, and those who embraced the sentiments of the Remonstrants, *to be false teachers* (pro falsis doctoribus); *and that they only waited for a national synod*, of which there then appeared to be a bright prospect, *so that in it there might be made a legitimate secession from the Remonstrants, which should be put into execution after an ecclesiastical trial.*" See *Phil. a Limborch's* Relatio historica de origine et progressu controversiar. in fœderato Belgio, p. 18. The provincial synods that were held before the synod of Dort, so arranged every thing, as to give the Contra-Remonstrants the upper hand. In particular, they deposed Remonstrant ministers, as e. g., *Uytenbogaart*, *Grevinchovius*, and others. And in electing ministers to attend the national synod, the Remonstrants were wholly passed by: and only from the district of Utrecht, were two Remonstrant delegates sent to Dort; and even these were excluded, as soon as the cause of the Remonstrants came on. See *Limborch*, loc. cit., and *Wagenær's* History of the United Netherlands, (in German), vol. iv., p. 446, &c. Thus far, *Schlegel*.—Undoubtedly, nearly or quite every minister in Holland had an opinion formed, with regard to the correctness of the doctrines charged upon the Remonstrants, and the propriety of permitting their propagation. It could not be otherwise, as these opinions had been preached and published abundantly, for ten years, and had been the great theme of discussion among theologians. In such circumstances, to be ignorant of the alleged Arminian doctrines, or to have no opinion concerning them, would have been altogether unbecoming in a clergyman. It was therefore a thing of course, and no reproach upon their characters, that the divines at Dort should come together with opinions already made up, on the *theological* questions they were to discuss.—*Tr.*]

(15) [*Bogermann* was minister of Leeuwarden, an avowed enemy of the Arminians, who had already written against them, and who was so full of the persecuting spirit of *Beza*, that he had translated into Dutch, *Beza's* book de Hæreticis a magistratu puniendis. And his whole behaviour at the synod showed, that he was better qualified to be the papal legate at a council of Trent, than the moderator of a Protestant synod.—*Schl.* *Bogermann* was doubtless too zealous, and in several instances, too severe and passionate in his speeches. But his intolerant spirit was the spirit of the age. Christian forbearance and tenderness towards the erring, was then no where well understood, and duly practised.—*Tr.*]

(16) ["Here our author has fallen into a palpable mistake. The Dutch divines had no commission, but from their respective consistories, or subordinate ecclesiastical assemblies; nor are *they* ever the depositaries of the orders of their magistrates, who have lay deputies to represent them both in provincial and national synods. As to the English and other *foreign* doctors that appeared in the synod of Dort, the case perhaps may have been somewhat different."—*Macl.*]

That, in the council itself, the voice of the illustrious and very honourable men who appeared as the legates of *Maurice* and the States-General, had more influence, than that of the theologians who sat as the judges.—V. That the promise, made to the Arminians when summoned before the council, *that they should have liberty to state, explain, and defend their opinions as far as they were able and deemed it necessary*, was violated by the council.(17)

§ 8. The Arminians being adjudged enemies of their country and of religion, were subjected to severe animadversion. First, they were all deprived both of their sacred and their civil offices; and then, their preachers were ordered to refrain from preaching altogether. Such as would not submit to this order, were ignominiously sent into exile, and subjected to other punishments and indignities. Hence many retired to Antwerp, and others to France: and a large body of them emigrated to Holstein, by the invitation of *Frederic* duke of Holstein, and built the handsome town of *Frederickstadt* in the duchy of Sleswick. In that town the Arminians still live in tranquillity, and enjoy the free exercise of their religion. The leaders of this colony were men of distinction in Holland, especially *Adrian van der Wahl*, the first governor of the town of Frederickstadt.(18) Among the clergymen who accompanied this colony, the most distinguished were, the famous *Conrad Vorstius*, who drew a great deal of odium upon the Arminians by his sentiments, which were none too remote from those of the Socinians; *Nicholas Grevinchovius*, a man of acuteness, who had been a preacher at Rotterdam; *Simon Goulart; John Grevius; Marcus Walther; John Narsius;* and others.(19)

§ 9. *Maurice*, under whose government the Arminians suffered so greatly, died in 1625. By the clemency of his brother and successor, *Frederic Henry*, the Armenian exiles were recalled, and restored to their former reputation and tranquillity. Those therefore returned, who had retired to France and to the Spanish Netherlands: and they established

(17) See *Mich. le Vassor's* Histoire du regne de Louis XIII., tome iii., livr. xii., p. 365, 366, and my notes on *J. Hale's* Historia concilii Dordraceni, p. 394–400.—[The words of the promise were: Liberum illis fore, ut proponant, explicent, et defendant, *quantum possent et necessarium judicarent, opiniones SUAS.* This promise, the Arminians contended, gave them liberty to state so many of their own doctrines and in such an order, as they pleased; and also to state their views of the sentiments or doctrines of their opposers, and to refute them, as fully and in such a manner, as they pleased. Whether this was a fair and reasonable construction of the words of the promise, and such a construction as the synod were bound to admit, the reader will judge. Yet it was the refusal of this, and the requiring the Remonstrants to state and defend only *their own* sentiments, and to proceed in regard to them methodically, that the Remonstrants complained of, as a violation of the promises made them. See the Remonstrants' views of a proper council, presented to the synod December 10th; the decree of the synod of the 29th Dec., and the synod's explanation of it, December 29th; and also the communication of the Remonstrants to the synod, on the 21st of January; all which documents are given by the Remonstrants themselves, in their Acta et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena, pt. i., p. 4, &c., 140, &c., 159, &c.—*Tr.*]

(18) The history of this colony may be learned from the noted Epistolæ præstantium et eruditorum virorum ecclesiasticæ et theologicæ, published by *Phil. Limborch* and *Christ. Hartsœcker*; the latest ed. Amsterd., 1704, fol. Compare *Jo. Möller's* Introductio in Histor. Chersonesus Cimbricæ, pt. ii., p. 108, &c., and *Eric Pontoppidan's* Annales ecclesiæ Danicæ diplomatici, tom. iii., p. 714, &c.

(19) Concerning *Vorstius*, *Jo. Möller* treats very fully, in his Cimbria Litterata, tom. ii., p. 931, &c. He also treats expressly, of the other persons here mentioned; ibid, tom. ii., p. 242, 247, 249, 255, 576.

congregations distinct from the Reformed, in various places, and particularly at Rotterdam and Amsterdam. In order to have a seminary for their own sect and religion, they founded a distinguished school at Amsterdam; in which two professors train up young men for the ministry, the one teaching theology, and the other history, philosophy, and the learned languages. *Simon Episcopius* was the first professor of Arminian theology; and since him, these offices have been filled, down to the present time, by men highly famed for learning and genius, namely, *Stephen Curcellæus*, *Arnold Poellenburg*, *Philip Limborch*, *John le Clerc*, *Adrian van Cattenburgh*,(20) and *John James Wetstein*.

§ 10. The Remonstrants as we have seen, differed at first from the Reformed, in nothing except the five propositions concerning grace and predestination; and it was on this ground that they were condemned at the synod of Dort. They moreover so explained those five propositions, that they seemed to teach precisely what the Lutherans do. But from the time of the synod of Dort, and still more after the exiles were allowed to return to their country, they professed an entirely new species of religion, different from the views of all other sects of Christians. For most of them not

(20) Of these and the other Arminian writers, *Adrian van Cattenburg* treats expressly, in his Bibliotheca Scriptorum Remonstrantium; Amsterd., 1728, 4to. [*Episcopius* was born at Amsterdam, a pupil of *Arminius*, and after the deposition of *Vorstius*, his successor at Leyden; an eloquent and acute man, who being full of theological skepticism, began to question many of the received opinions, e. g., the doctrine of original sin. He died in 1643, as professor in the Arminian Gymnasium at Amsterdam. His life written by *Limborch*, and his writings, were published by *Curcellæus* and *Poelenburg*, Amsterd., 1650, 1665, 2 vols. fol.—*Curcellæus* (*Courcelles*) was born at Geneva, of French parentage, and early showed a propensity towards Arminianism, which he defended against the decrees of Dort. He died in 1659, an Arminian professor at Amsterdam. His theological works were published collectively by *Limborch*, Amsterd., 1675, fol. His fine edition of the Greek New Testament with various readings, is well known.—*Pöllenburg* was born at Horn in the Netherlands, where he became a preacher. Thence he was removed to Amsterdam, as a preacher; was made successor to *Curcellæus* in his professorship there, and died in 1666.—*Limborch* was brother's grandson to *Simon Episcopius*, first a preacher at Gouda and then at Amsterdam, and lastly professor there; where he also died in 1712. He was a modest theologian, who united great learning with extraordinary clearness of style in his writings. This is manifest by his Theologia Christiana. Also his Amica collatio cum erudito Judæo de veritate religionis Christianæ, his Historia Inquisitionis, and his collection of the Epistles of Remonstrants, are important works; as likewise his very temperately written Relatio historica de origine et progressu controversiar. in fœdærato Belgio de prædestinatione et capitib. annexis.—*Le Clerc* was born and educated at Geneva, and professor of Hebrew, philosophy and the fine arts, and afterwards of church history, in the Arminian Gymnasium at Amsterdam; and died in 1736, aged 79. His Epistolæ Theologicæ, under the name of *Liberius de S. Amore*; Sentimens de quelques theologiens d'Hollande sur l'Histoire critique du V. T. par R. Simon: his Journals, (periodical works, containing analyses and Reviews of books, with orignal essays interspersed), namely, Bibliotheque universelle et Historique, (1686–1693, in 26 dense volumes, 12mo); Bibliotheque Choisie, (1703–1713, in 28 vols. 12mo); Bibliotheque ancienne et moderne, 1714–1727, in 29 vols. 12mo); his Commentaries on the Old Testament; Ars Critica; Harmony of the Gospels; Histoire des provinces unies de Pays bas, (from 1560 to 1728, in 3 vols. fol.; his Historia litteraria duorum primorum a Christo sæculorum, 1716, 4to), and his editions of classical and other authors, have procured him a great name among the learned. —*Cattenburgh* was professor of theology in the Arminian Gymnasium at Amsterdam, till the year 1730. He wrote Bibliotheca scriptorum Remonstrantium; Spicilegium Theologiæ Christianæ Limborchianæ; and some works explanatory of the Bible.—*Wetstein* succeeded *Le Clerc*, after being deposed at Basle, and died in 1754, (aged 61). His critical edition of the New Testament, (1751–2, in 2 vols. fol.), is well known.—*Schl.*]

only gave such an explanation of these propositions, as seemed to differ very little from the views of those who deny that a man needs any divine aid whatever, in order to his conversion and living a holy life; but they also lowered down very much most of the doctrines of Christianity, by subjecting them to the modifications of reason and human ingenuity. *James Arminius*, the parent of the sect, undoubtedly invented this form of theology, and taught it to his followers;(21) but it was *Simon Episcopius*, the first master in the Arminian school after its founder, and a very ingenious man, who digested and polished it and reduced it to a regular system.(22)

§ 11. The whole system of the Remonstrants is directed to this one simple object, to unite the hearts of Christians who are divided by a variety of sentiments and opinions, and to gather them into one fraternity or family, notwithstanding they may differ in many points of doctrine and worship. To accomplish this object, they maintain, that *Christ* does not require of his

(21) It is a common opinion, that the early Arminians who flourished before the synod of Dort, were much purer and more sound, than the later ones who lived and taught after that council; and that *Arminius* himself only rejected *Calvin's* doctrine of absolute decrees and its necessary consequences, while in every thing else he agreed with the Reformed; but that his disciples, and especially *Episcopius*, boldly passed the limits which their master had wisely established, and went over to the camp of the Pelagians and Socinians. But it appears to me very clear, that *Arminius* himself revolved in his own mind, and taught to his disciples, that form of religion which his followers afterwards professed; and that the latter, especially *Episcopius*, only perfected what their master taught them, and casting off fear, explained it more clearly. I have as a witness, besides others of less authority, *Arminius* himself; who, in his *Will* drawn up a little before his death, explicitly declares that his aim was to bring all sects of Christians, with the exception of the papists, into one community and brotherhood. We will cite his words, from *Peter Bertius'* Funeral Oration on Arminius, p. 15. Ea proposui atque docui —— quæ ad propagationem, amplificationemque veritatis, religionis Christianæ, veri Dei cultus, communis pietatis, et sanctæ inter homines conversationis, *denque ad convenientem Christiano nomini tranquillitatem et pacem* juxta verbum Dei *possent conferre, excludens ex iis Papatum*, cum quo nulla unitas fidei, nullum pietatis aut Christianæ pacis vinculum servari potest. Now what, I ask, is this, but *that* very Arminianism of more recent times, which extends so wide the boundaries of the Christian church, that all sects may live harmoniously within them, whatever opinions they may hold, except only the professors of the Romish religion!—[The opinion, that *Arminius* himself was very nearly orthodox, and *not an Arminian* in the common acceptation of the term, has been recently advocated by professor *Stuart* of Andover, in an article expressly On the Creed of Arminius; in the Biblical Repository, No. II., Andover, 1831. See p. 293 and 301. To such a conclusion the learned professor is led, principally, by an artful and imposing statement, made by *Arminius* to the magistrates of Holland in the year 1608, one year before his death, on which Mr. *Stuart* puts the most favourable construction the words will bear. But from a careful comparison of this declaration of *Arminius*, with the original *Five Articles* of the Arminian Creed, (which were drawn up almost in the very words of *Arminius*, so early as the year 1610, and exhibited by the Remonstrants in the conference at the Hague in 1611; and were afterwards, together with a full explanation and vindication of each article, laid before the synod of Dort in 1619, changing however the dubitation of the *fifth* article into a positive denial of the saint's perseverance); it will, I think, appear manifest, that *Arminius* himself actually differed from the *orthodox* of that day, *on all the five points;* and that he agreed substantially with the *Remonstrants*, on all those doctrines, for which they were condemned in the synod of Dort. And that such was the fact, appears to have been assumed without hesitation, by the principal writers of that and the following age, both Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants.—*Tr.*]

(22) A life of this celebrated man, which is well worth reading, was composed by *Philip Limborch*, and first published in Dutch, and then more full and complete, in Latin, Amsterd., 1701, 8vo.

followers to *believe* much, but to *do* much, or to cultivate love and virtue: and of course they give a very broad definition of a true Christian. For according to them, every person belongs to the kingdom of Christ, who—I. receives the holy Scriptures and particularly the New Testament, as the rule of his religion, whatever may be the interpretation he gives to those books: —II. is opposed to the worship of many gods, and to whatever is connected with such an abomination:—III. leads an upright life, conformable to the divine law: and IV. never troubles or disturbs those who differ from him on religious subjects, or who interpret the books of the New Testament in a different manner from what he does. By these principles a wide door is opened to all who honour Christ, though differing widely in sentiments, to enter into the Arminian communion. Yet the papists are excluded from it, because they think it right to persecute, and to put to death such as oppose the Romish prelate.(23) And indeed, if other Christians would abide by these precepts, the great diversities of opinion among them would clearly be no obstacle to their mutual love and concord.

§ 12. It hence appears, that the Arminian community was composed of persons of various descriptions; and that it had properly no fixed and stable form of religion, or to use a common phrase, no *system* of religion. They would not indeed wish to be thought destitute of a bond of union; and therefore they show us a sort of Confession of faith, drawn up with sufficient neatness by *Simon Episcopius*, for the most part in the very words of the sacred writers, and which they represent as their formula and rule of faith.(24) But as none of their teachers are so tied to this formula by oath or promise, as not to be at liberty to depart from it; and on the contrary, as every one, from the constitution of the sect, is allowed to construe it according to his own pleasure,—and it is capable of different expositions, —it must be manifest that we cannot determine at all, from this Confession, what they approve and what they reject. And hence their public teachers advance very different sentiments, respecting the most weighty doctrines of the Christian religion.(25) Nor do they all follow one determinate and uniform course in almost any thing, except in regard to the doctrines of

(23) In place of all others, *Simon Episcopius* may here be consulted, in his tract, entitled: Verus Theologus Remonstrans, sive veræ Remonstrantium Theologiæ de errantibus dilucida declaratio; which is extant in his Opera, tom. i., p. 508, &c., and like the rest of his productions, is neatly and perspicuously written. *John le Clerc* sums up the doctrines of his sect, in the Dedication of his Latin translation of Hammond's New Testament, which is addressed to the learned among the Remonstrants, in this manner, p. 3. Profiteri soletis —— eos duntaxat a vobis excludi, qui (I.) idololatria sunt contaminati, (II.) qui minime habent Scripturam pro fidei norma, (III.) qui impuris moribus sancta Christi præcepta conculcant, (IV.) aut qui denique alios religionis caussa vexant.—Many tell us, that the Arminians regard as brethren, all who merely assent to what is called the *Apostles' Creed*. But a very competent witness, *John le Clerc*, shows that this is a mistake: Bibliotheque Ancienne et moderne, tome xxv., p. 119. Ils se trompent: Ils (les Arminiens) offrent la communion à tous ceaux, qui reçoivent l'Ecriture Sainte comme la seule regle de la foi et des mœurs, et qui ne sont ni Idolatres, ni persecuteurs.

(24) This Confession is extant in Latin, Dutch, and German. The Latin may be seen in the Works of *Episcopius*, tom. ii., pt. ii., p. 69; where also, p. 97, may be seen an *Apology* for this Confession, by the same *Episcopius*, written against the Divines of the university of Leyden.

(25) This any one may see with his own eyes, by only comparing together the writings of *Episcopius*, *Curcellæus*, *Limborch*, *Le Clerc*, and *Cattenburgh*. [Those Arminians who agree with the Reformed in all doctrinal points, except the Five Articles contained in their remonstrance, are for distinction's sake, called *Quinquarticulans*.—*Schl.*]

predestination and grace. For they all continue to assert most carefully, though in a very different manner from their fathers, the doctrine which excluded their ancestors from the pale of the Reformed church; namely, that the love of God embraces the whole human race, and that no one perishes through any eternal and insuperable decree of God, but all merely by their own fault. Whoever attacks this doctrine, attacks the whole school or sect: but one who may assail any other doctrines contained in the writings of Arminians, must know that he has no controversy with the Arminian *church*, whose theology with few exceptions, is unsettled and fluctuating, but only with some of its doctors; who do not all interpret and explain in the same manner, even that one doctrine of the universal love of God to mankind, which especially separates the Arminians from the Reformed.

§ 13. The Arminian community at the present time, is very small if compared with the Reformed: and if common report be true, it is decreasing continually. They have at present, [1753], thirty four congregations in Holland, some smaller and some larger; over which are forty-four ministers: out of Holland, they have one at Frederickstadt. But the principles adopted by their founders, have spread with wonderful rapidity over many nations, and gained the approbation of vast numbers. For to say nothing of the English, who adopted the Arminian doctrines concerning grace and predestination as early as the times of *William Laud*, and who on the restoration of *Charles* II. assented in great measure to the other Arminian tenets; who is so ignorant of the state of the world, as not to know that in many of the courts of Protestant princes, and almost every where among those who pretend to be wise, this sentiment which is the basis of Arminianism, is prevalent; namely, that very few things are necessary to be believed in order to salvation; and that every one is to be allowed to think as he pleases, concerning God and religion, provided he lives a pious and upright life. The Hollanders, though they acknowledge that the sect which their fathers condemned, is gradually declining in numbers and strength, yet publicly lament that the opinions of the sect are spreading farther and farther, and that even those to whose care the decrees of the council of Dort were intrusted, are corrupted by them. How much inclined towards them, many of the Swiss especially the Genevans are, and also many of the French, is very well known.(26) The form of church government and the mode of worship among the Arminians, are very nearly the same as among the Reformed of the *Presbyterian* churches. Yet the leaders of the sect, as they neglect no means tending to preserve and strengthen their communion with the English church, so they show themselves very friendly to episcopal government; and they do not hesitate to affirm, that they regard it as a holy form, very ancient, and preferable to the other forms of government.(27)

(26) [*Dr. Maclaine* has here a long and elaborate note, on the tendency of the Leibnitian and Wolfian philosophy to support Calvinism. The reasoning is ingenious and good. But the effects actually produced by this philosophy seem to be greatly overrated, when he says: "that the progress of *Arminianism* has been greatly retarded, nay, that its cause daily declines in *Germany* and several parts of *Switzerland*, in consequence of the ascendant which the Leibnitian and Wolfian philosophy hath gained in these countries, and particularly among the clergy and men of learning." When *Dr. Maclaine* wrote thus, about the year 1763, the Germans were going fast into what is called German *neology*, and particularly among the clergy and men Socinianism; and the philosophy, he speaks of, was rapidly waning.—*Tr.*]

(27) Hence,—to omit many other things

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF THE QUAKERS.

§ 1. Origin of the Quakers. George Fox.—§ 2. First Movements of the Sect under Cromwell.—§ 3. Progress, in the Times of Charles II. and James II.—§ 4. Propagation out of England.—§ 5. Their Controversies.—§ 6. Their Religion generally.—§ 7. First Principle.—§ 8. Its Consequences.—§ 9. Concerning Christ.—§ 10. Discipline and Worship.—§ 11. Moral Doctrines.—§ 12. Form of Government.

§ 1. Those who in English are called *Quakers*, are in Latin called *Tremontes* or *Tremuli*. This name was given them in the year 1650, by *Gervas Bennet*, a justice of the peace in Derbyshire ;(1) but whether, because their whole body trembled before they began to speak on religious subjects ; or because *Fox* and his associates said, that a man ought to tremble at hearing the word of God ; does not sufficiently appear. In the mean time they suffer themselves to be called by this name, provided it be correctly understood. They prefer however to be named from their primary doctrine, *Children* or *Professors of the Light*. In familiar discourse, they call each other *Friends*.(2) The origin of the sect falls on those times in English history, when civil war raged universally, and when every one who had conceived in his mind a new form either of civil government or of religion, came forth with it from his obscure retreat into public view. Its parent was *George Fox*, a shoemaker, a man naturally very gloomy, shunning society, and peculiarly fitted to form visionary conceptions. As early as the year 1647, when he was twenty-three years old, he travelled over some of the counties of England, giving out that he was full of the Spirit, and exhorting the people to attend to the voice of the divine word, which lies concealed in the hearts of all. After *Charles* I. was beheaded, when both civil and ecclesiastical laws seemed to be extinguished together, he attempted greater things. For having acquired numerous disciples and friends of both sexes, among persons of a similar temperament with himself, in connexion with them he set all England in commotion ; nay in 1650, he broke up assemblies for the public worship of God, where he was able, as being useless and not truly Christian.(3) For this reason, he and his associates were several times thrown into prison and chastised by the magistrates.(4)

which place this beyond doubt,—they have taken so much pains to show, that *Hugo Grotius*, their hero and almost their oracle, commended the English church in the highest degree, and that he preferred it before all others. See the collection of proofs for this, by *John le Clerc*, subjoined to his edition of Grotius' book, de Veritate religionis Christianæ, p. 376, &c., ed. Hague, 1724, 8vo.

(1) See *George* [*William*] *Sewel's* History of the Quakers, p. 23, [vol. i., p. 43, ed. London, 1811]. *Daniel Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. iv , p. 32, &c., [ed. Boston, 1817, p. 60, 61 ; where see *Toulmin's* note. —*Tr.*]

(2) *Sewel*, loc. cit., p. 624, [vol. ii., p. 589, ed. Lond., 1811 ; also *Dan. Neal*, Hist. of Puritans, vol. iv., p. 60, 61, ed. Boston, 1817.—*Tr.*]

(3) [*Fox* and his adherents looked upon all worship of God, which did not proceed immediately from the impulse of the Spirit within, as abominable in the sight of God. Hence he had no reverence for the religious worship of most of the sects of Christians around him. Yet it does not appear that he felt it to be his duty to attempt, forcibly, to interrupt or suppress such worship. But feeling bound always to obey the impulse of the Spirit, and supposing himself to have

§ 2. The first association of Quakers was composed, in great measure, of delirious and infatuated persons; and therefore committed many acts,

this impulse while in or near the places of worship, he sometimes was led to speak in them to the annoyance of the congregation, and was treated as a disturber of public worship. Three instances are mentioned, all occurring in the year 1649. The first was at Nottingham; and is thus related by *Sewel*, vol. i., p. 36, ed. 1811. He "went away to the steeple-house, where the priest took for his text these words of the apostle *Peter*, *We have a most* (more) *sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts.* And he told the people, that this was the *Scripture*, by which they were to try all doctrines, religions, and opinions. *G. Fox* hearing this, felt such mighty power and godly zeal working in him, that he was made to cry out, O! no, it is not the *Scripture*, but it is the *Holy Spirit*, by which the holy men of God gave forth the Scriptures, whereby opinions, religions, and judgments, are to be tried. That was *it*, which led into all truth, and gave the knowledge thereof. For the Jews had the Scriptures, and yet resisted the Holy Ghost, and rejected Christ, the bright morning-star, and persecuted him and his apostles; though they took upon them to try their doctrines by the Scriptures; but they erred in judgment, and did not try them aright, because they did it without the Holy Ghost. Thus speaking, the officers came and took him away, and put him in a nasty stinking prison."—The next instance, was at Mansfield; and is thus related by the same author, vol. i., p. 38. "While *G. Fox* was in this place, he was moved to go to the steeple-house, and declare there the truth to the priest and the people; which doing, the people fell upon him, and struck him down, almost smothering him, for he was cruelly beaten and bruised with their hands, Bibles, and sticks. Then they hauled him out, though hardly able to stand, and put him into the stocks, where he sat some hours; and they brought horsewhips, threatening to whip him. After some time, they had him before the magistrates, at a knight's house; who seeing how ill he had been used, set him at liberty, after much threatening. But the rude multitude stoned him out of the town."—The third instance occurred at Market Bosworth, and is thus concisely stated by *Sewel*, vol i., p. 39, &c. "Coming into the public place of worship, he (*Fox*) found Nathaniel Stephens preaching, who, as hath been said already, was priest of the town where *G. Fox* was born; here *G. Fox* taking occasion to speak, Stephens told the people he was mad, and that they should not hear him; though he had said before to one colonel Purfoy, concerning him, that there was never such a plant bred in England. The people now being stirred up by this priest, fell upon *G. Fox* and his friends, and stoned them out of the town." See a Refutation of erroneous statements, &c., by authority of the Yearly Meeting of Friends for New-England, dated New-Bedford, 12th month 9th, 1811, subjoined to *Mosheim's* Eccles. Hist., ed. New-York, 1824, vol. iv., p. 295, &c. *Neal's* Hist. of Purit., ed. *Toulmin*, Boston, 1817, vol. iv., p. 58, 59.—*Tr.*]

(4) Besides the common historians of this century, see especially *Gerhard Cræsius* (*Cræse*), a Dutch clergyman's, Historia Quackeriana tribus libris comprehensa, ed. 2, Amsterd., 1703, 8vo. On this however, *Kohlhans* [under the name of *Philalethes*], a doctor of physic, and a Lutheran who became a Quaker, published *Dilucidationes*, (explanations), Amsterd., 1696, 8vo. And undoubtedly *Croese's* book, though neatly written, contains numerous errors. Yet the French history of the Quakers; Histoire abregée de la naissance et du progrès du Kouakerisme, avec celle de ses dogmes, Cologne, 1692, 12mo, is much worse. For the author does not so much state what he found to be facts, as heap together things true and false without discrimination, in order to produce a ludicrous account. See *Gerh. Cræse's* Hist. Quackeriana, lib. ii., p. 322 and 376, and *John le Clerc's* Bibliotheque Universelle et Hist., tome xxii., p. 53, &c. But altogether the most full and authentic, being derived from numerous credible documents and in part from the writings of *Fox* himself, is the Quaker *George* [*William*] *Sewel's* History of the Christian People called Quakers, [first written in Dutch, and translated by the author into English, Lond., 1722, fol., and 1811, 2 vols. 8vo], translated from the English into German, and printed 1742, fol. This work exhibits great research, as well as fidelity: yet on points dishonourable or disadvantageous to the Quakers, he dissembles, conceals, and beclouds not a little. Still, the statements of *Sewel* are sufficient to enable a discerning and impartial man to form a just estimate of this sect. *Voltaire* also has treated of the religion, the morals, and the history of these people, though rather to amuse than to enlighten the reader, in four letters written with his usual elegance: Mélanges de litterature et de philosophie; Œuvres, tome iv.,

which the more temperate Quakers of the present day, extenuate indeed, but by no means commend or approve. For most of them, both male and female, declaimed vehemently against all other religions; assailed the public worship and the ministers of religion, with insult and abuse; treated the commands of magistrates and the laws, with contempt, under the pretence of conscience and a divine impulse; and greatly disturbed both the church and the state. It is therefore not strange, that many of them often suffered severe punishments for their rashness and folly.(5) *Cromwell*, though

cap. iii.–vi., p. 160, &c. [With which, compare "A letter from one of the people called Quakers (*Josiah Martin*) to *Francis de Voltaire*, Lond., 1742.] In general, what he says, is true and to be relied on, being derived from *Andrew Pitt*, a Quaker of London: but the witty man, to render his account more entertaining, has adorned it with poetic colouring, and added some things of his own. From these works chiefly, was compiled, though not with due accuracy, the Dissertation on the Religion of the Quakers in that splendid work: Cerémonies et coûtumes religieuses de tous les peuples du monde, tome iv., p. 124, &c. Among us, *Fred. Ern. Mois* published a small German work, concerning this sect, and especially the English portion of it: Entwurf des Kirchen-Ordnung und Gebräuche der Quæcker in Engelland, 1715, 8vo. [Later works are, *John Gough's* History of the people called Quakers, Lond., 1789, 3 vols. 8vo. *Thomas Clarkson's* Portraiture of Quakerism, 3 vols. 8vo, Lond. and New-York, 1806. A summary of the History, doctrines, and discipline of Friends, written at the desire of the Meeting for Sufferings in London, 1800, and subjoined to Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., ed. New-York, 1824, vol. iv., p. 307–327; also *Joshua Toulmin*, D.D., Supplements annexed to his edition of *Neal's* Hist. of the Puritans, vol. iv., p. 296–308, 518–552, and vol. v, p. 126–140. 245–261.—*Tr.*]

(5) See Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iv., p. 153, &c., [ed. 1817, p. 174, &c.] Sewel's Hist. of the Quakers, in various places. [Mr. Neal, in the passage just named, gives account of the offensive conduct of some of the first Quakers, and of the punishments to which they were subjected. And Dr. *Toulmin*, in his notes, corrects the statements of *Neal*, and vindicates the Quakers. The story of *James Nayler* is there stated. This honest enthusiast, who had been an admired speaker among the Quakers, very improperly suffered some misguided individuals to style him, the *everlasting Son of righteousness; the Prince of peace; the only-begotten Son of God; the fairest among ten thousand.* He likewise allowed some of them to kiss his feet, when imprisoned at Exeter; and after his release, to conduct him in triumph to Bristol; one man walking bareheaded before him; another, a woman, leading his horse; and others spreading their scarfs and handkerchiefs in the way, and crying, *Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Hosts; Hosanna in the highest; holy, holy, is the Lord God of Israel.* The magistrates of Bristol caused him to be apprehended, and transmitted him to the parliament, which tried him for blasphemy. He alleged, that these honours were not paid to *him*, but to *Christ who dwelt in him*, and said: "If they had it from the Lord, what had I to do to reprove them? If the Father has moved them to give these honours to *Christ*, I may not deny them; *if they have given them to any other but to Christ, I disown them.*" "*I do abhor, that any honours due to God, should be given to me, as I am a creature;* but it pleased the Lord to set me up as a *sign* of the coming of the righteous One, and what has been done to me passing through the town, I was commanded by the power of the Lord to suffer to be done to the outward man, as a sign: but I abhor any honour as a creature." Manifest as it was, that the man was beside himself, and had no intention to allow divine honours to be paid to himself, he was condemned to be branded, have his tongue bored with a hot iron, sit in the pillory, be whipped through the streets of London and Bristol, and then to be imprisoned during the pleasure of parliament: and this cruel sentence was executed. But during his imprisonment he came to his senses, and very fully and penitently acknowledged his fault. The great body of Quakers, at the time, expressly disapproved his conduct; and they promptly ejected him from their community, but afterwards upon his repentance restored him. Such in substance, is the famous case of *James Nayler*; which though a solitary case, and disapproved at the time by the mass of the Quakers, has continued to this day, to occasion high censure to be cast upon the whole sect.—That the early Quakers sometimes mistook the conclusions of their own minds, for suggestions of the Spirit, and that they needlessly adopted odious singularities, or did not comply so far as they ought with the customs and usages of society, nor treat the religion of

otherwise not hostile to any sect, yet was afraid of this turbulent multitude; and at first he determined to suppress it. But when he perceived, that all his promises and his threatenings could make no impression on them, he prudently refrained, and deemed it advisable, merely to take care that they should not excite seditions among the people and weaken the foundations of his power.(6)

§ 3. Gradually however, the excessive ardour of the rising sect subsided, as it was natural to expect; and that divine light to which the Quakers made pretensions, by degrees ceased to disturb the commonwealth. In the reign of *Charles* II. both their religion and their discipline assumed a more definite and fixed character. In this business, *Fox* was assisted especially by *Robert Barclay*, a Scotch knight, *George Keith*, and *Samuel Fisher;* learned men, who had connected themselves with his sect.(7) For these

others with that respect and decorum, which are necessary to the peace of a community in which various religions are tolerated; many will think to be very manifest. Yet on the other hand, there was doubtless a great want of candour and forbearance towards them. Their errors were magnified, and their indiscretions punished as high-handed crimes. One of their own writers, (*Gough*, Hist. of the Quakers, vol. i., p. 139, &c.), says: "A Christian exhortation to an assembly, after the priest had done and the worship was over, was denominated *interrupting* public worship, and disturbing *the priest in his office;* an honest testimony against sin, in the streets or markets, was styled a *breach of the peace;* and their appearing before the magistrates covered, a *contempt of authority:* hence proceeded *fines, imprisonments, and spoiling of goods.*"—*Dr. Mosheim's* representation of the modern Quakers as more moderate and decorous than their fathers in the days of Cromwell, seems to be in general correct. Yet the author of a Refutation of erroneous statements relative to the society of Quakers, (in *Mosheim's* Eccl. Hist., vol. iv., p. 304, &c.), makes the following remarks, which are worthy of being inserted here. "*Dr. Mosheim* has in several instances, endeavoured to impress the reader with the idea, that the ancient and modern Quakers were entirely different people, both in respect to their principles and conduct. This is the more worthy of notice, as it is an error not by any means peculiar to him; but which in a degree prevails very generally. We view the modern Quakers with our own proper vision, and through a medium cleared from the discolorations of that, through which we view the ancient; and they appear to us a quiet, orderly, moral, and religious people. But in the accounts transmitted to us by their enemies, we view the ancient Quakers, through a discoloured medium, a vision extremely acrimonious, and tinged with bile; and they appear to us fanatic, turbulent, and riotous. If we were to imagine to ourselves the modern Quakers, passing through our country, as they actually do; seeking and conversing with sober inquirers, appointing meetings for religious worship; and if at the same time, we were to imagine a mob of dissolute and enraged rabble, at their heels, scoffing, and beating them with sticks and stones, to interrupt their meetings, without the least marks of violence or even of defensive resistance to any, on their part. If we imagine some unworthy ministers and magistrates rather instigating their fury, the latter sending them to prison, charged with the riots to which themselves had been accessory; the Quakers submitting to all, with a patience unconquerable, yet pursuing their mission with undeviating perseverance, not to be paralleled in history since the days of the first promulgators of the Christian faith; we might then perhaps view a true picture of the ancient Quakers; their principles, their doctrine, and their manners being the same."—*Tr.*]

(6) *Clarendon* tells us, in his History of the Rebellion and of the civil Wars in England, [French ed.], vol. vi., p. 437, that the Quakers remained always violent enemies to *Cromwell.* See *Sewel*, loc. cit., book iii., p. 91, 113, 148, 149, &c., [ed. 1811, vol. i., p. 168, 209, 273, 275, &c.]

(7) Respecting *Barclay*, see Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. et Crit., tome i., p. 67, &c. Respecting *Keith*, see *Sewel*, Hist. of the Quakers, p. 429, 490, 544, 560. Respecting *Fisher*, see the Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1750, p. 338, &c. [*Robert Barclay* was descended from an honourable family; but he was not a *knight.* For the history of him, the Quakers refer us to the account of him by *William Penn* and others, his contemporaries, prefixed to the edition of his works in folio, 1692. For the life of *Fisher,* they refer us to *Wm. Penn's* account of him, annexed to Fisher's works, fol., 1679—*Tr.*]

three men digested and reduced to fixed principles, the loose and vague discipline of *Fox*, who was an illiterate man.(8) Yet for a long time, these wiser and more quiet Quakers had to endure even more suffering and calamity in England, than the insane and turbulent had experienced; though not so much for their religion, as for their manners and customs. For as they would not address magistrates by their honorary titles, and pay them customary respect; as they refused the oath of allegiance to the king; and as they would not pay tithes to the clergy; they were looked upon as bad citizens and dangerous men, and were often severely punished.(9) Under *James* II. and especially after the year 1685, they began to see better days: for which they were indebted to the celebrated *William Penn*, who was employed by the king in state affairs of the greatest importance.(10) At length, *William* III. who gave peace to all sects of dissenters from the reigning church, allowed these people also, to enjoy public liberty and tranquillity.(11)

§ 4. Oppressed and persecuted in their own country, the Quakers sought to propagate their sentiments among foreign nations, and to establish for themselves more secure habitations. Attempts were made in Germany, Prussia, France, Italy, Greece, Holland, and Holstein; but generally without effect. Yet the Dutch, at length were prevailed upon, to allow some families the liberty of residing among them; which they enjoy to the present time. Many of these people, not long after the sect arose, proceeded to America. And afterwards, by a singular turn of things, the seat of its liberties and fortunes was established, as it were, in that quarter of the world. *William Penn*, the son of the English vice-admiral, adopted the Quaker religion in 1668; and in the year 1680, *Charles* II. and the parlia-

(8) [The Quakers consider this statement of *Mosheim*, as being unjust to the character of *George Fox*. And indeed, *William Penn*, who certainly knew *Fox's* character well, and was no incompetent judge of men, in his preface to Fox's Journal, says: "He was a man, that God endowed with a clear and wonderful depth, a discerner of others' spirits, and very much a master of his own. —In all things he acquitted himself like a man, a new and heavenly-minded man, a divine and a naturalist, and all of God Almighty's making. I have been surprised at his questions and answers in natural things, that while he was ignorant of useless and sophistical science, he had in him the foundation of useful and commendable knowledge, and cherished it every where." As to the Quaker discipline, their monthly meetings, &c., the records of the sect, they tell us, contain nothing from which it may be inferred that *Barclay*, *Keith*, and *Fisher*, had any share in its formation; or that it was not chiefly, if not wholly, brought into form and operation by *Fox*. He describes circumstantially his journeys through England, to establish the monthly meetings. This was in the year 1667; the very year that *Barclay* joined the society, being then only 19 years old. *Samuel Fisher* died two years before this time, after lying in prison a year and a half. See *Jos. G. Bevan's* Refutation of some modern misrepresentations of the Society of Friends, Lond., 1800, 12mo, and the Vindication of the Quakers, subjoined to *Mosheim's* Eccles. Hist., ed. Philad., 1800, and N. York, 1824.—*Tr.*]

(9) See *Dan. Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. iv., p. 313, 353, 396, 432, 510, 518, 552, 569. *Gilb. Burnet's* History of his own Times, vol. i., p. 271. *Sewel*, loc. cit., passim. [The Quakers were conscientious in all these singularities; and though we may consider them as scrupulous without good reason, and contrary to the example of Christ and his apostles, who paid tribute to the priests, submitted to civil oaths, and addressed magistrates by their usual titles; yet as *they* could not think so, they ought to have been indulged. The fact probably was, that many people of that age could not believe, that they were actuated merely by scruples of conscience; and others, who did suppose this might be the case, were not disposed to indulge the consciences of those who erred. —*Tr.*]

(10) See *Sewel's* History of the Quakers, p. 538, 546, 552, 564, 591, 605, &c.

(11) Œuvres de *Mr. de Voltaire*, tom. iv., p. 182.

ment, granted to him an extensive province in America, at that time being a wilderness, in reward for the great services rendered by his father to the nation. *Penn*, who was a man of discernment and also eloquent, conducted a colony of his friends and associates into his new dominions; and there established a republic, in form, laws, and regulations, unlike any other in the known world, yet a peaceful and happy one, and which still flourishes in great prosperity.(12) The Quakers there are predominant; yet all persons may become citizens, who acknowledge that there is but one supreme God whose providence is over all human affairs, and who pay him homage, if not by outward signs, yet by uprightness of life and conduct The province was named, from its proprietor, *Pennsylvania*; and the principal city is called *Philadelphia*.

§ 5. While *Fox* was still alive, there were frequent dissensions and broils among the Quakers, (in the years 1656, 1661, 1683, and in other years), not indeed respecting religion itself, but respecting discipline, customs, and things of minor consequence. But these contests, for the most part were soon adjusted.(13) After the death of *Fox*, (which occurred in 1691), among others, *George Keith* especially, the most learned man of the whole sect, gave occasion to greater commotions. For *Keith* was thought by the other brethren in Pennsylvania, to entertain sentiments not accordant with the truth on several points, but especially in regard to the human nature of Christ. He maintained that our Saviour possessed a twofold human nature, the one celestial and spiritual, the other terrene and corporeal.(14) This and the other inventions of *Keith* would perhaps have been tolerated with much moderation, by a people who place all religion in an indescribable sense or instinct, if he had not strongly reproved some strange opinions of the American brethren; and in particular, had he not opposed their turning the whole history of our Saviour into an allegory, or a symbolical representation of the duties that religion requires of man. In Europe indeed, the Quakers dare not deny the truth of the history of Jesus Christ; but in America, where they have nothing to fear, they are said to utter what they think, and to deny any *Christ* who exists without us. This controversy between *Keith* and the other Quakers, which was discussed in several general meetings of the whole sect in England, and even brought before the British parliament, was at last decided in the year 1695, by the exclusion of *Keith* and his adherents from communion in worship. Touched with a sense of injury,(15) after some years, *Keith* returned to the English church and died in its communion.(16) His friends long held their separate meet-

(12) The charter, the laws, and other papers relating to the establishment of this new commonwealth, were published [in *Rapin's* History; *Penn's* Works; and] not long since, in the Bibliotheque Britannique, tom. xv., pt. ii., p. 310; tom. xvi., pt. i., p. 127. *Penn* himself acquired a high reputation, by several productions of his pen, and by other things. *Sewel* treats of him, in several places; and *Burnet* also, in his History of his own times.

(13) See *Sewel's* History of the Quakers, p. 126, 132, 262, 429, 529, &c.

(14) Cérémonies et coûtumes de tous les peuples du monde, tome iv., p. 141, &c. *Gerh. Cræsius*, Historia Quackeriana, lib. iii., p. 446, &c.

(16) *Gilb. Burnet's* History of his own Times, vol. ii., p. 290. The commotions about *Keith*. are treated of by *William Sewel*, History of the Quakers, p. 577, 592, 603. But either he did not understand the true nature of the controversy, (which might be, as he was not a man of learning), or he designedly perverts and obscures it. More light is thrown on it, in the German *Life* of *Henry Bernh. Küster*, published in *Rahtlef's* Gelehrten Europa, vol. iii., p. 484. For *Küster*, a man of probity, then lived in America, and was an eyewitness of the

ings; but if report may be credited, they have now become reconciled with the brethren.(17)

§ 6. The religion of the Quakers appears, at first view, to be a novel thing: but it is not so, in fact. For it is the ancient *Mystic theology*, which arose in the second century, was fostered by *Origen*, and has been handed down to us by men of various characters and genius; now a little expanded and enlarged, by the addition of consequences before not well understood. The well-meaning *Fox*, indeed, did not invent any thing; but all that he taught, respecting the internal word or light, and its powers, he undoubtedly derived either from the books of the *Mystics*, a multitude of which were then circulating in England, or from the discourses of some person initiated in the Mystic doctrines. But the doctrines which he brought forward confusedly and rudely, (for he was a man of uncultivated mind, and not adorned and polished with any literature or science), the sagacity of *Barclay*, *Keith*, *Fisher*, and *Penn*, embellished, and reduced to such coherency, that they exhibit the appearance of a digested system or body of doctrine. The Quakers therefore, may be justly pronounced the principal sect of [modern] Mystics, who have not only embraced the precepts of that arcane wisdom, but have likewise seen whither those precepts lead, and have received at once all the consequences that flow from them.(18)

transactions.—[Dr. *Mosheim* appears to have been misinformed, respecting *George Keith*, and his controversy with the American Quakers; and therefore with many others, he has given us *Keith's* false and slanderous representations, as being a true account.—*Keith* was a Scotchman, born and liberally educated in the Scotch church. How and when he became a Quaker, is not known. But for more than five-and-twenty years, he travelled, preached, wrote, and suffered, among the Quakers of England and Scotland. During this period he was one of their most learned and efficient ministers, and was held by them in high estimation. In the year 1689, he removed to America, and settled in Philadelphia, where he was made master of the principal school among the Quakers. He now attempted to direct and reform the discipline of the society, and to assume a dictation which was offensive to his brethren. Mutual alienation took place; and *Keith* dealt out his censures both of men and measures, with great freedom. A party adhered to him; but the great body of Quakers, whom he was continually assailing, thought proper in the year 1692, to lay him under censure. *Keith* and his party still professed to be in communion with the English Quakers; but when the yearly meeting of Philadelphia sent an account of his case to the yearly meeting of London, in the spring of the year 1694, *Keith* thought proper to appear there, in vindication of his conduct. He asked, and obtained a hearing; and the yearly meeting of London, after a full examination of the case, approved entirely of the proceedings of the American Quakers, and excluded *Keith* from all fellowship, *for his factious and unchristian conduct, and his false criminations of the American brethren.* A few however, adhered to him in England, and he set up a separate meeting in London, and laboured much during several years, to destroy that faith which he had spent so many years in defending and propagating. His misrepresentations of the views of the Quakers were abundant; and they were answered and confuted, with no little success, from his own former publications. Meeting with but little success in forming a new party, and gradually departing farther and farther from Quaker principles, he in the year 1700, wholly renounced Quakerism, and became an Episcopal clergyman. In this capacity he visited America in the year 1702, hoping to draw many Quakers into the English church. But his former partisans in America, though not yet reconciled with the Quakers, would not follow him into the established church. Being entirely unsuccessful in America, *Keith* returned to England, became a parish minister, and died a few years after. See *Gough's* History of the Quakers, vol. iii., p. 317–350, 382–390, 442–455. *Sewel's* History of the Quakers, vol. ii., p. 493–495, 496, &c., 526–534, 574.—*Tr*]

(17) See *William Rogers'* Christian Quaker, Lond, 1699. 4to, and The Quakers a divided people, Lond., 1708, 4to. Unschuldige Nachrichten, A.D. 1744, p. 496, &c.

(18) Most persons think, that we are to learn what the Quakers believe and teach,

§ 7. Their fundamental doctrine therefore, and that on which all their other doctrines depend, is that very ancient maxim of the Mystic school: That there lurks in the minds of all men, a portion of the divine reason or nature, or a spark of that wisdom which is in God himself. That whoever is desirous of true happiness and eternal salvation, must, by turning his thoughts inward and away from external objects, (or by contemplation, and weakening the empire of the senses), elicit, kindle, and inflame this *hidden, divine spark*, which is oppressed and suffocated by the mass of the body and by the darkness of the flesh, with which our souls are surrounded. That whoever shall do so, will find a wonderful light rise upon him, or a celestial voice break upon him out of the inmost recesses of the soul, which will instruct him in all divine truth, and be the surest pledge of union with the supreme God. This natural treasure of mankind, is called by various

from *Robert Barclay's* Catechism, or still better, from his Apology for the true Christian Divinity; which was published, Lond., 1676, 4to, and translated into other languages. Nor shall I much object to this opinion, if it be understood to mean, that this sect is exceedingly desirous, that others should judge of the nature of their religion by these books. But if any would have us believe, that these books contain every thing the Quakers regard as true, and that nothing more than these contain, was formerly taught among them or is now taught, he may be easily confuted from numerous publications. For *Barclay* assumed the office of an *advocate*, not that of a teacher; and of course he explains the sentiments of his sect, just as those do who undertake to defend an odious cause. In the first place, he is silent on points of Christianity of the utmost importance, concerning which it is very desirable to know the true sentiments of the Quakers; and he exhibits a really mutilated system of theology. For it is the practice of advocates, to pass over the things that cannot easily be placed in an advantageous light; and to take up only such things as ingenuity and eloquence can make appear plausible and excellent. In the next place, he touches upon several things, the full exposition of which would bring much odium on the Quakers, only cursorily and slightly; which is also an indication of a bad cause. Lastly, and to go no farther, the things which he cannot deny or conceal, he explains in the most delicate and cautious manner, in common, ordinary phraseology, not very definite, avoiding carefully all the appropriate and almost consecrated terms adopted by the sect. Now it will not be very difficult for one who will take such a course, to give a specious appearance to any the most absurd doctrines. And it is well known, that in this way the doctrine of *Spinoza* has been disguised and painted up by some of his disciples. There are other writers of this sect, who express their sentiments much more clearly and freely; among whom, *William Penn* and *George Whitehead*, very celebrated men, deserve to be read preferably to all others. Among their other works, there is one entitled: The Christian Quaker and his Divine Testimony vindicated, by Scripture, Reason, and Authorities, against the injurious attempts that have been lately made by several adversaries; Lond., 1674, small folio. *Penn* wrote the first part, and *Whitehead*, the second. There is also extant, in *Sewel's* History, p. 578, a *Confession of Faith*, which the Quakers published in 1693, in the midst of the controversy with *Keith*. But it is very cautiously drawn up, and a great part of it ambiguous.—[Dr. *Toulmin* thinks, that Dr. *Mosheim* is here uncandid and unjust towards *Barclay*; and that he has exposed himself to the just animadversions of *Gough*, in his History of the Quakers, vol. ii., p. 401–406. See *Toulmin's* note to Neal, vol. v., p. 253, ed. Boston, 1817. Not having *Barclay's* Apology before me, I will pass no judgment on the justice or injustice of Dr. *Mosheim's* statements. But I will say, that I do not understand him to charge *Barclay* with direct and wilful misrepresentations; but only with so far acting the *advocate*, that his book is not the best guide to a full and correct knowledge of the sentiments of the Quakers: and consequently, that it is necessary to consult other works, such as the writings of *Penn* and *Whitehead*, if we would fully and truly understand the Quaker system. Now this may be so, while still the Vindication of the Quakers, by the committee representing the yearly meeting of Friends in Philadelphia, A.D. 1799, may very honestly and truly say: "As to our tenets and history, we refer to *Fox, Barclay, Penn, Sewel, Gough*, &c., and declare, that we never had, nor now have, any other doctrines to publish, and that there are no religious opinions or practices among us, which have not been made known to the world."—*Tr.*]

names; very often by that of a *divine light;* sometimes, *a ray of eternal wisdom;* sometimes, *celestial sophia;* concerning whose nuptials, under a female garb, with man, some of this class of people speak in magnificent terms. The terms best known among us, are, *the internal Word*, and *Christ within us*. For as they hold the sentiment of the ancient Mystics and of *Origen*, that *Christ* is the *reason* and *wisdom* of God, and suppose all men to be furnished with a particle of the divine wisdom, they are obliged to maintain that *Christ*, or the *Word of God*, resides, acts, and speaks, in all persons.(19)

§ 8. Whatever other singular and strange sentiments they may hold, all originated from this one principle, as their prolific source. Because Christ resides in every son of Adam, therefore; I. All religion consists in man's averting his mind from external objects, weakening the empire of the senses, turning himself inward upon himself, and listening with his whole attention to what the Christ in his breast or the internal light dictates and enjoins.—II. The external word, that is, the holy scriptures, does not enlighten and guide men to salvation; for words and syllables, being lifeless things, cannot have power to illumine the soul of man and to unite it to God. The only effect of the inspired books upon one who reads them, is, to excite and stimulate him to attend to the internal word, and to seek the school of Christ teaching within him. Or, to express the same thing in other words; the Bible is a mute guide, which by signs points and directs to the living master residing in the soul.—III. Those who are destitute of this written word, pagans, Jews, Mohammedans, and the barbarous nations, want indeed some aid for obtaining salvation, but not the way or the discipline of salvation itself. For if they would give heed to the internal teacher, who is never silent when the man listens to him, they might abundantly learn from him whatever is necessary to be known and to be done.—IV. The kingdom of Jesus Christ therefore is of vast extent, and embraces the whole human race. For all men carry Christ in their souls; and by him, though living in the greatest barbarism, and totally ignorant of the Christian religion, they may become wise and happy, both in this life and in that to come. They who live virtuously, and restrain the cravings of lust, whether they are Jews, Mohammedans, or pagans, may become united to God through Christ residing in their souls in this world, and so be united to him for ever.—V. The principal hinderance to men's perceiving and hearkening to Christ present within them, is the heavy, dark body, composed of vicious matter, with which they are envel-

(19) Yet the modern Quakers, as appears from the writings of *Josiah Martin* and others, are ignorant of the true sentiments of their forefathers, and perpetually confound this inherent and innate light, with that light of the Holy Spirit which is shed on the minds of the pious. [This declaration of *Dr. Mosheim*, clearly shows that he did not understand the fundamental principle of the Quakers, which is essentially different from that of the ancient Mystics. The *particle of the divine nature*, which the Mystics supposed to be a constituent part of man at his first creation, or a *natural principle* in all men, and which was sufficient to enlighten, guide, and sanctify them, provided the influences of the *body* or of *sense* could be counteracted; was quite a different thing from the *internal light* of the Quakers. For the latter is supposed to be a *revelation* made to the soul, by *Christ* acting through the Holy Spirit. It is therefore *grace*, not *nature;* a divine communication to fallen men, and not an original principle in their natural constitutions: and its influences and operations are moral, not physical. It is therefore not strange, that the Quakers should complain of this and the following sections, as totally misrepresenting their fundamental principles. —*Tr.*]

oped. And hence all possible care must be taken, that this connexion of soul and body do not blunt the mind, disturb its operations, and by means of the senses fill it with images of external things. And on this account, it is not to be supposed that when the souls of men shall have escaped this prison, God will again thrust them into it; but what the scriptures tell us of the resurrection of our bodies, must either be understood figuratively, or be referred to new and celestial bodies.(20)

§ 9. These things show, that the religion of the Quakers can conveniently dispense with a *Christ without;* and with all that Christians believe on the authority of the holy scriptures, concerning his divine origin, life, merits, sufferings, and atonement. Because the whole ground of salvation lies in the *Christ within.* Not a few of them therefore, as we learn from very credible authors, once fell into the absurdity to maintain, that the whole narrative in the scriptures respecting Jesus Christ, is not the history of the Son of God clothed in human nature, but the history of Christ within us, decorated with poetic imagery and allegory. This opinion, if we may give credit to very respectable witnesses, is so far from having become extinct among them, that on the contrary it still prevails and is taught in America. But the Europeans, either from the force of truth or compelled by fear, maintain that the divine *wisdom* or *reason* descended into the son of the virgin *Mary*, and by him instructed mankind; and that this divine man actually did and suffered, what he is recorded to have done and suffered. At the same time, they express themselves very ambiguously, respecting many things pertaining to Christ; in particular, respecting the fruits of his sufferings and death, their statements are so loose and meager that it is altogether uncertain and dubious, what and how great they suppose these fruits to be. Besides, they have not renounced wholly the [figurative] interpretation of the history of Christ, above mentioned; for they press us hard to grant, that the things which occurred in regard to our Saviour while resident among men, are signs and emblems of the things which may occur, and must occur, in relation to the Christ within, in order

(20) These propositions all Quakers admit; or at least *ought* to admit, if they would not entirely depart from the first principles of their system. The doctrines concerning which they disagree and dispute among themselves, we here pass over, lest we should appear disposed to render the sect odious. [It is so far from being true, that "all Quakers admit these propositions," that they declare them to be mere fictions of *Dr. Mosheim*, or consequences which he, and not they, deduce from their first principle. And indeed, they seem to be a philosophical creed, essentially diverse from the true belief of the Quakers. See the preceding note. According to the belief of the Quakers, the conflicting principles in sinful men, are not, a *particle of the divine nature* opposed and weighed down by the *material body;* but they are, *divine grace* or the gracious operations of the *Holy Spirit*, conflicting with the corrupt *nature of fallen man.* This divine *grace*, they hold indeed, as the Arminians also do, to be universal, or to be afforded to all mankind, as soon as they become moral agents. They likewise believe with the Arminians, that the teachings and influences of this grace, are sufficient, if duly improved, to lead those who have not the Scriptures, to holiness and to salvation. Neither is it true, that they deny the resurrection of the body; though they seem to have an idea, that the future spiritual body will so differ from the present body, that it cannot be called *the same.* Thus *Henry Tuke*, (as quoted in *Rees'* Cyclopædia, article *Quakers*), says: "The doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is so connected with the Christian religion, that it will be also proper to say something on this subject. In explaining our belief of this doctrine, we refer to the fifteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. In this chapter (verses 40, 42, 44, 50) is clearly laid down the *resurrection* of *a body*, though not of the *same body* that dies. Here we rest our belief in this mystery, without desiring to pry into it, beyond what is revealed to us."—*Tr.*]

to a man's partaking of salvation. And hence they are accustomed, with the Mystics their preceptors, to talk much, in lofty terms and inflated style, of *Christ's* being born, living, dying, and rising to life, in the hearts of saints.(21)

§ 10. From the same source which has been mentioned, [namely, the ancient Mystic theology], has flowed their discipline and practice. They assemble indeed, on the days in which other Christians generally assemble for religious purposes. But they neither observe festival days, nor use ceremonies and rites, nor suffer religion to be coupled with any positive institutions; placing it wholly in the worship of Christ hidden in the heart. Such as please, teach in their assemblies, both men and women: for who may deny to the persons in whom *Christ* dwells and speaks, liberty to address and instruct the brethren? Prayers, hymns, and the other exercises which distinguish the public assemblies of other Christians, are unknown and discarded by them: and not without reason, since they believe with the Mystics, that to pray truly, is not to utter the desires of our hearts in a set form of words, but to collect the mind, recall it from all emotion and thought, and fix it wholly on a present Deity. Neither do they baptize new members of their community; nor renew the benefits of Christ's death and the benefits of it, in the Lord's supper. For they suppose both institutions to be Judaical; and to have been formerly used by the Saviour, only to represent to the eye, in visible imagery, by baptism the mystical purification of the soul, and by the holy supper the spiritual nourishment of it.

§ 11. The system of morals adopted by them, is beyond measure austere and forbidding. It is chiefly comprehended in these two precepts:— I. Whatever can afford us pleasure, produce agreeable emotions, or gratify the senses, must either be wholly avoided, or if by the laws of nature this is impossible, it must be so tempered and checked by reason and reflection that it may not corrupt the soul.(22) Because, as the mind ought

(21) [In answer to most of the allegations in this section, the Quakers refer us, triumphantly, to the following extracts from their declaration or Confession of faith, drawn up in the year 1693, and preserved by *Sewel*, Hist. of the Quakers, vol ii., p. 497, &c. "We sincerely profess faith in God, by his only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ, as being our only *light* and *life*, our *only way* to the Father, and our *only Mediator* and *Advocate* with the Father:—That God created all things, and made the worlds, by his Son, Jesus Christ; he being that powerful and living *Word* of God, by whom all things were made: and that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, are *One*, in divine Being inseparable; one true, living, and eternal God, blessed for ever:—Yet that this Word or Son of God, in the fulness of time, *took flesh*, became *perfect man*, according to the flesh, descended and came of the seed of Abraham and David, but was miraculously conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the virgin *Mary*; and also farther, declared powerfully to be the Son of God, according to the Spirit of sanctification, by the resurrection from the dead:—That *as man, Christ died for our sins*, rose again, and was received up into glory in the heavens; he having, *in his dying for all, been that one, great, universal offering and sacrifice for peace, atonement and reconciliation between God and man*; and he is the *propitiation*, not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world: We were *reconciled by his death*, but *saved by his life*:—That divine *honour* and *worship* is due to the Son of God; and that he is, in true faith, to be prayed unto, and the name of the Lord Jesus Christ called upon, (as the primitive Christians did), because of the glorious union or oneness of the Father and the Son."—*Tr.*]

(22) [The first part of this precept, (total avoidance of pleasures), the Quakers themselves say, "Is no tenet of the Quakers." To the latter part of the precept, they make no objection; believing it to be coincident with the apostle *James'* direction, "To keep himself unspotted by the world."—*Tr.*]

to be always and exclusively attentive to the voice, and the intimations of the teacher within, it should be separated from the intercourse and contagion of the body and corporeal things.—II. It is criminal to follow the customs, fashions, and manners that are generally received in society. Hence they are easily distinguished from other people, by their outward deportment and manner of life. They do not salute those they meet; never use the customary language of politeness and civility; never show respect to magistrates and to men of rank, by any bodily gestures, or the use of honorary titles; never defend their lives, their property, or their reputations, against violence and slander; never take an oath; never seek redress in civil courts, or prosecute those who injure them: on the contrary they distinguish themselves from all their fellow-citizens, by their aspect and demeanour, by their dress, which is very simple and rustic, by their phraseology, their diet, and other outward things. It is however affirmed by persons of credibility, that the Quakers, especially the prosperous Quaker merchants of England, have already departed considerably from these austere rules of life, and are gradually departing farther and farther; nay, that they explain and shape much more wisely the religious system of their ancestors. It is also well attested, that very many of them have but an imperfect knowledge of the religion transmitted to them by their fathers.

§ 12. This sect, at its commencement, had no organization and government. But afterwards, the leading men perceived that their community could not subsist, and escape falling into great disorder, unless it had regulations, and men to superintend its affairs. Hence boards of elders were established, who discuss and regulate everything involving doubt and difficulty, and carefully watch that no one conduct amiss, or do anything injurious to the society. To these elders, those give in their names who contemplate marrying: to them are reported all births and deaths in the society: to them, such as wish publicly to address the people, exhibit their discourses, and in some places they must be written out; that the elders may see, whether they will enlighten and edify.(23) For they do not allow, as they once did, every one at his pleasure to declaim before the people; since the very indiscreet orations of many, have brought much reproach and ridicule upon the society. There are also in the larger congregations, especially in London, certain persons whose duty it is to exhort the people, if it should so happen, that no one of the assembly is disposed to instruct and exhort the brethren; lest, as heretofore often happened, for want of an orator, the meeting should break up without a word said.(24) It is not indeed necessary, that there should be any speaking in the Quaker assemblies. For the brethren do not come together, to listen to an external teacher, but to attend to the voice of that teacher which each one carries in his own breast; or as they express it, *to commune with themselves* (ut semet ipsos introvertant).(25) But as their silent meetings afforded occasion to the enemies of the sect to carp, and to deride them, they

(23) [This duty of their elders, the Quakers deny; declaring that their speakers never write their discourses; and that no such practice as that here described, exists among them. Their speakers however, have a kind of license or approbation; or at least, when they travel abroad they carry some testimonials. And it is well known, that they have standing committees to superintend all publications, relating to the history and doctrines of the society.—*Tr.*]

(24) [Here again, the Quakers, through *Mr. Bevan* of London, deny the existence of such subsidiary speakers in their congregations.—*Tr.*]

(25) *Sewel*, Hist. of the Quakers, p. 612.

have now appointed fixed speakers; to whom also they give a small compensation for their services.(26) The Quakers annually hold a general convention of their whole society at London, the week before Whitsunday, in which all their congregations are represented; and by this convention all important questions are examined and decided. The Quakers at this day, complain of many grievances; but these all originate solely, from their refusal to pay tithes.

(26) [Here again *Dr. Mosheim* was misinformed. *Mr. Beran*, says "except a few clerks of this kind, (that is, who keep voluminous records, &c.), and persons who have the care of meeting-houses, none receive any stipend or gratuity for their services in our religious society."—*Tr.*]

SUPPLEMENT

RELATING TO THE DOCTRINES AND DISCIPLINE

OF THE

SOCIETY OF FRIENDS, COMMONLY CALLED QUAKERS.*

CHAPTER I.

DOCTRINE.

General Belief.—Universal and Saving Light.—Worship.—Ministry.—Women's Preaching.—Baptism and the Supper.—Universal Grace.—Perfection.—Oaths and War.—Government.—Deportment.—Conclusion.

We agree with other professors of the Christian name, in the belief of one eternal God, the Creator and Preserver of the universe; and in Jesus Christ his Son, the Messiah, and Mediator of the new covenant.(*a*)

When we speak of the gracious display of the love of God to mankind, in the miraculous conception, birth, life, miracles, death, resurrection, and ascension of our Saviour, we prefer the use of such terms as we find in scripture; and contented with that knowledge which divine wisdom hath seen meet to reveal, we attempt not to explain those mysteries which remain under the veil; nevertheless we acknowledge and assert the divinity of Christ, who is the wisdom and power of God unto salvation.(*b*)

To Christ alone we give the title of the Word of God,(*c*) and not to the scriptures; although we highly esteem these sacred writings, in subordination to the Spirit,(*d*) from which they were given forth; and we hold, with the apostle Paul, that they are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.(*e*)

We reverence those most excellent precepts which are recorded in scripture to have been delivered by our great Lord, and we firmly believe that they are practicable, and binding on every Christian; and that in the life to come, every man will be rewarded according to his works.(*f*) And further it is our belief, that, in order to enable mankind to put in practice these sacred precepts, many of which are contradictory to the unregener-

* [*Dr. Mosheim's* account of the Quakers is so very faulty, that the American editions of the work have generally been accompanied with other statements, derived from other and better authorities. In the preceding notes, many of the mistakes of Dr. Mosheim have been pointed out. But still it is believed, that full justice will not be done to the principles of this sect, without allowing them to express their religious views in their own language. The following Supplement is therefore annexed, being part of a "Summary of the History, Doctrine, and Discipline of Friends, written at the desire of the Yearly Meeting for Sufferings in London;" first published in a small work, by *Joseph Gurney Bevan*, Lond., 1800, 12mo, and afterwards annexed to the 4th vol. of Maclaine's Mosheim, ed. New-York, 1824.—*Tr.*]

(*a*) Heb. xii, 24. (*b*) 1 Corinth. i., 24. (*c*) John i., 1. (*d*) 2 Pet. i., 21. (*e*) 2 Tim. iii., 15. (*f*) Mat. xvi., 27.

ate will of man,(*g*) every man coming into the world, is endued with a measure of light, grace, or good Spirit of Christ; by which, as it is attended to, he is enabled to distinguish good from evil, and to correct the disorderly passions and corrupt propensities of his nature, which mere reason is altogether insufficient to overcome. For all that belongs to man is fallible, and within the reach of temptation; but this divine grace, which comes by him who hath overcome the world,(*h*) is, to those who humbly and sincerely seek it, an all-sufficient and present help in time of need. By this, the snares of the enemy are detected, his allurements avoided, and deliverance is experienced through faith in its effectual operation: whereby the soul is translated out of the kingdom of darkness, and from under the power of Satan, into the marvellous light and kingdom of the Son of God.

Being thus persuaded that man, without the Spirit of Christ inwardly revealed, can do nothing to the glory of God, or to effect his own salvation; we think this influence especially necessary to the performance of the highest act of which the human mind is capable; even the worship of the Father of lights and of spirits, in spirit and in truth: therefore we consider as obstructions to pure worship, all forms which divert the attention of the mind from the secret influence of this unction from the Holy One.(*i*) Yet, although true worship is not confined to time and place, we think it incumbent on Christians to meet often together,(*k*) in testimony of their dependance on the Heavenly Father, and for a renewal of their spiritual strength: nevertheless, in the performance of worship, we dare not depend, for our acceptance with him, on a formal repetition of the words and experiences of others; but we believe it to be our duty to lay aside the activity of the imagination, and to wait in silence to have a true sight of our condition bestowed upon us: believing even a single sigh,(*l*) arising from such a sense of our infirmities, and the need we have of divine help, to be more acceptable to God, than any performances, however specious, which originate in the will of man.

From what has been said respecting worship, it follows that the ministry we approve must have its origin from the same source: for that which is needful for man's own direction, and for his acceptance with God,(*m*) must be eminently so to enable him to be helpful to others. Accordingly we believe that the renewed assistance of the light and power of Christ, is indispensably necessary for all true ministry; and that this holy influence is not at our command, or to be procured by study, but is the free gift of God to chosen and devoted servants. Hence arises our testimony against preaching for hire, in contradiction to Christ's positive command, "Freely ye have received, freely give;"(*n*) and hence our conscientious refusal to support such ministry, by tithes or other means.

As we dare not encourage any ministry, but that which we believe to spring from the influence of the Holy Spirit, so neither dare we attempt to restrain this influence to persons of any condition in life, or to the male sex alone; but, as male and female are one in Christ, we allow such of the female sex as we believe to be endued with a right qualification for the ministry, to exercise their gifts for the general edification of the church: and this liberty we esteem a peculiar mark of the gospel dispensation, as foretold by the prophet Joel,(*o*) and noticed by the apostle Peter.(*p*)

(*g*) John i., 9. (*h*) Ibid. xvi., 33. (*i*) 1 John ii., 20, 27. (*k*) Heb. x., 25. (*l*) Rom. viii., 26. (*m*) Jer. xxiii., 30–32. (*n*) Matt. x., 8. (*o*) Joel ii., 28, 29. (*p*) Acts ii., 16, 17.

There are two ceremonies in use among most professors of the Christian name, Water-baptism, and what is termed the Lord's Supper. The first of these is generally esteemed the essential means of initiation into the church of Christ; and the latter of maintaining communion with him. But as we have been convinced, that nothing short of his redeeming power, inwardly revealed, can set the soul free from the thraldom of sin; by this power alone we believe salvation to be effected. We hold that as there is one Lord and one faith,(*q*) so his baptism is one, in nature and operation; that nothing short of it can make us living members of his mystical body; and that the baptism with water, administered by his forerunner John, belonged, as the latter confessed, to an inferior and decreasing dispensation.(*r*)

With respect to the other rite, we believe that communion between Christ and his church is not maintained by that, nor any other external performance, but only by a real participation of his divine nature(*s*) through faith; that this is the supper alluded to in the Revelation,(*t*) "Behold I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me;" and that where the substance is attained, it is unnecessary to attend to the shadow; which doth not confer grace, and concerning which, opinions so different, and animosities so violent, have arisen.

Now, as we thus believe that the grace of God, which comes by Jesus Christ, is alone sufficient for salvation, we can neither admit that it is conferred on a few only, while others are left without it; nor, thus asserting its universality, can we limit its operation to a partial cleansing of the soul from sin, even in this life. We entertain worthier notions both of the power and goodness of our heavenly Father, and believe that he doth vouchsafe to assist the obedient to experience a total surrender of the natural will, to the guidance of his pure unerring spirit; through whose renewed assistance they are enabled to bring forth fruits unto holiness, and to stand perfect in their present rank.(*u*)

There are not many of our tenets more generally known than our testimony against Oaths, and against War. With respect to the former of these, we abide literally by Christ's positive injunction, delivered in his sermon on the mount, "Swear not at all."(*v*) From the same sacred collection of the most excellent precepts of moral and religious duty, from the example of our Lord himself,(*w*) and from the correspondent convictions of his Spirit in our hearts, we are confirmed in the belief that wars and fightings are, in their origin and effects, utterly repugnant to the gospel; which still breathes peace and good-will to men. We also are clearly of the judgment, that if the benevolence of the gospel were generally prevalent in the minds of men, it would effectually prevent them from oppressing, much more enslaving, their brethren (of whatever colour or complexion), for whom, as for themselves, Christ died; and would even influence their conduct in their treatment of the brute creation: which would no longer groan, the victims of their avarice, or of their false ideas of pleasure.

Some of our tenets have in former times, as hath been shown, subjected our friends to much suffering from government, though to the salutary

(*q*) Eph. iv., 5. (*r*) John iii., 30. (*s*) 2 Pet. i., 4. (*t*) Rev. viii., 20. (*u*) Matt. v., 48; Eph. iv., 13; Col. iv., 12. (*v*) Matt. v., 34. (*w*) Matt. v., 39, 44, &c.; ch. xxvi., 52, 53; Luke xxii., 51; John xviii., 11.

purposes of government, our principles are a security. They inculcate submission to the laws in all cases wherein conscience is not violated. But we hold, that as Christ's kingdom is not of this world, it is not the business of the civil magistrate to interfere in matters of religion; but to maintain the external peace and good order of the community. We therefore think persecution, even in the smallest degree, unwarrantable. We are careful in requiring our members not to be concerned in illicit trade, nor in any manner to defraud the revenue.

It is well known that the society, from its first appearance, has disused those names of the months and days, which having been given in honour of the heroes or false gods of the heathen, originated in their flattery or superstition; and the custom of speaking to a single person in the plural number, as having arisen also from motives of adulation. Compliments, superfluity of apparel and furniture, outward shows of rejoicing and mourning, and the observation of days and times, we esteem to be incompatible with the simplicity and sincerity of a Christian life; and public diversions, gaming, and other vain amusements of the world, we cannot but condemn. They are a waste of that time which is given us for nobler purposes; and divert the attention of the mind from the sober duties of life, and from the reproofs of instruction, by which we are guided to an everlasting inheritance.

To conclude, although we have exhibited the several tenets which distinguish our religious society, as objects of our belief; yet we are sensible that a true and living faith is not produced in the mind of man by his own effort; but is the free gift of God(*x*) in Christ Jesus, nourished and increased by the progressive operation of his Spirit in our hearts, and our proportionate obedience.(*y*) Therefore, although for the preservation of the testimonies given us to bear, and for the peace and good order of the society, we deem it necessary that those who are admitted into membership with us, should be previously convinced of those doctrines which we esteem essential; yet we require no formal subscription to any articles, either as a condition of membership, or a qualification for the service of the church. We prefer the judging of men by their fruits, and depending on the aid of Him, who, by his prophet, hath promised to be "a spirit of judgment to him that sitteth in judgment."(*z*) Without this, there is a danger of receiving members into outward communion, without any addition to that spiritual sheepfold, whereof our blessed Lord declared himself to be both the door and the shepherd;(*a*) that is, such as know his voice, and follow him in the paths of obedience.

(*x*) Eph. ii., 8. (*y*) John vii., 17. (*z*) Isaiah xxviii., 6. (*a*) John x., 7, 11.

CHAPTER II.

DISCIPLINE.

Its Purposes.—Meetings for Discipline.—Monthly-Meetings.—Poor.—Convinced Persons —Certificates of Removal.—Overseers.—Mode of dealing with Offenders.—Arbitration —Marriages.—Births and Burials.—Quarterly-Meetings.—Queries.—Appeals.—The Yearly-Meeting.—Women's Meetings.—Meetings of Ministers and Elders.—Certificates to Ministers.—The Meeting for Sufferings.—Conclusion.

The purposes which our discipline hath chiefly in view, are, the relief of the poor,—the maintenance of good order,—the support of the testimonies which we believe it is our duty to bear to the world,—and the help and recovery of such as are overtaken in faults.

In the practice of discipline, we think it indispensable that the order recommended by Christ himself be invariably observed :(*a*) "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word may be established: and if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church."

To effect the salutary purposes of discipline, meetings were appointed, at an early period of the society, which, from the times of their being held, were called Quarterly-meetings. It was afterwards found expedient(*b*) to divide the districts of those meetings, and to meet more frequently; from whence arose Monthly-meetings, subordinate to those held quarterly. At length, in 1669,(*c*) a Yearly meeting was established, to superintend, assist, and provide rules for, the whole: previously to which, general meetings had been occasionally held.

A Monthly-meeting is usually composed of several particular congregations,(*d*) situated within a convenient distance from each other. Its business is to provide for the subsistence of the poor, and for the education of their offspring; to judge of the sincerity and fitness of persons appearing to be convinced of the religious principles of the society, and desiring to be admitted into membership ;(*e*) to excite due attention to the discharge of religious and moral duty; and to deal with disorderly members. Monthly-Meetings also grant to such of their members as remove into other monthly-Meetings certificates of their membership and conduct; without which they cannot gain membership in such meetings. Each Monthly-meeting is required to appoint certain persons, under the name of overseers, who are to take care that the rules of our discipline be put in practice;

(*a*) Matt. xviii., 15–17. (*b*) Sewel, 485. (*c*) Fox. 390.

(*d*) Where this is the case, it is usual for the members of each congregation to form what is called a Preparative-meeting, because its business is to prepare whatever may occur among themselves, to be laid before the Monthly-meeting.

(*e*) On application of this kind, a small committee is appointed to visit the party, and report to the Monthly-meeting; which is directed by our rules not to admit any into membership, without allowing a seasonable time to consider their conduct.

and when any case of complaint, or disorderly conduct, comes to their knowledge, to see that private admonition, agreeably to the gospel rule before mentioned, be given, previously to its being laid before the Monthly-meeting.

When a case is introduced, it is usual for a small committee to be appointed, to visit the offender, to endeavour to convince him of his error, and to induce him to forsake and condemn it.(*f*) If they succeed, the person is by minute declared to have made satisfaction for the offence; if not, he is disowned as a member of the society.(*g*)

In disputes between individuals, it has long been the decided judgment of the society, that its members should not sue each other at law. It therefore enjoins all to end their differences by speedy and impartial arbitration, agreeably to rules laid down. If any refuse to adopt this mode, or, having adopted it, to submit to the award, it is the direction of the Yearly-meeting that such be disowned.

To Monthly-meetings also belongs the allowing of marriages; for our society hath always scrupled to acknowledge the exclusive authority of the priests in the solemnization of marriage. Those who intend to marry, appear together, and propose their intention to the Monthly-meeting; and if not attended by their parents and guardians, produce a written certificate of their consent, signed in the presence of witnesses. The meeting then appoints a committee to inquire whether they be clear of other engagements respecting marriage; and if at a subsequent meeting, to which the parties also come and declare the continuance of their intention, no objections be reported, they have the meeting's consent to solemnize their intended marriage. This is done in a public meeting for worship, towards the close whereof the parties stand up, and solemnly take each other for husband and wife. A certificate of the proceedings is then publicly read, and signed by the parties, and afterwards by the relations and others as witnesses. Of such marriage the Monthly-meeting keeps a record; as also of the births and burials of its members. A certificate of the date, of the name of the infant, and of its parents, signed by those present at the birth, is the subject of one of these last-mentioned records; and an order for the interment, countersigned by the gravemaker, of the other. The naming of children is without ceremony. Burials are also conducted in a simple manner. The body, followed by the relations and friends, is sometimes, previously to interment, carried to a meeting; and at the grave a pause is generally made; on both which occasions it frequently falls out, that one or more friends present have somewhat to express for the edification of those who attend; but no religious rite is considered as an essential part of burial.

Several Monthly-meetings compose a Quarterly-meeting. At the Quarterly-meeting are produced written answers from the Monthly-meetings, to certain queries respecting the conduct of their members, and the meetings' care over them. The accounts thus received, are digested into one, which is sent, also in the form of answers to queries, by representatives, to the Yearly-meeting. Appeals from the judgment of Monthly-meetings, are brought to the Quarterly-meetings; whose business also it is to assist

(*f*) This is generally done by a written acknowledgment, signed by the offender.

(*g*) This is done by what is termed a Testimony of Denial: which is a paper reciting the offence, and sometimes the steps which have led to it; next, the means unavailingly used to reclaim the offender; after that, a clause disowning him; to which is usually added an expression of desire for his repentance, and for his being restored to membership.

in any difficult case, or where remissness appears in the care of the Monthly-meetings over the individuals who compose them.

The Yearly-meeting has the general superintendence of the society in the country in which it is established;(*h*) and therefore, as the accounts which it receives discover the state of inferior meetings, as particular exigences require, or as the meeting is impressed with a sense of duty, it gives forth its advice, makes such regulations as appear to be requisite, or excites to the observance of those already made; and sometimes appoints committees to visit those Quarterly-meetings which appear to be in need of immediate advice. Appeals from the judgment of Quarterly-meetings are here finally determined; and a brotherly correspondence, by epistles, is maintained with other Yearly-meetings.(*i*)

In this place it is proper to add, that, as we believe that women may be rightly called to the work of the ministry, we also think that to them belongs a share in the support of our Christian discipline; and that some parts of it, wherein their own sex is concerned, devolve on them with peculiar propriety; accordingly they have Monthly, Quarterly, and Yearly-meetings of their own sex, held at the same time and in the same place with those of the men; but separately, and without the power of making rules; and it may be remarked that during the persecutions, which in the last century occasioned the imprisonment of so many of the men, the care of the poor often fell on the women, and was by them satisfactorily administered.

In order that those who are in the situation of ministers may have the tender sympathy and council of those of either sex,(*j*) who, by their experience in the work of religion, are qualified for that service, the Monthly-meetings are advised to select such under the denomination of Elders. These, and ministers approved by their Monthly-meetings,(*k*) have meetings peculiar to themselves, called Meetings of Ministers and Elders; in which they have an opportunity of exciting each other to a discharge of their several duties, and of extending advice to those who may appear weak, without any needless exposure. Such meetings are generally held in the compass of each Monthly, Quarterly, and Yearly-meeting. They are conducted by rules prescribed by the Yearly-meeting, and have no authority to make any alteration or addition to them. The members of them unite with their brethren in the Meetings for discipline, and are equally accountable to the latter for their conduct.

It is to a meeting of this kind in London, called the Second day's Morning-meeting, that the revisal of manuscripts concerning our principles, previously to publication, is intrusted by the Yearly-meeting held in London; and also the granting, in the intervals of the Yearly-meeting, of certificates of approbation to such ministers as are concerned to travel in the work of the ministry in foreign parts; in addition to those granted by their Monthly and Quarterly-meetings. When a visit of this kind doth

(*h*) There are seven Yearly-meetings, viz., 1 London, to which come representatives from Ireland. 2 New-England, 3 New-York, 4 Pennsylvania and New-Jersey, 5 Maryland. 6 Virginia. 7 the Carolinas and Georgia.

(*i*) See the last note. (*j*) Fox. 461. 492.

(*k*) Those who believe themselves required to speak in meetings for worship, are not immediately acknowledged as ministers by their Monthly-meetings; but time is taken for judgment, that the meeting may be satisfied of their call and qualification. It will also sometimes happen, that such as are not approved, will obtrude themselves as ministers, to the grief of their brethren; but much forbearance is used towards these, before the disapprobation of the meeting is publicly testified.

not extend beyond Great Britain, a certificate from the Monthly-meeting of which the minister is a member is sufficient; if to Ireland, the concurrence of the Quarterly-meeting is also required. Regulations of similar tendency obtain in other Yearly-meetings.

The Yearly-meeting of London, in the year 1675, appointed a meeting to be held in that city, for the purpose of advising and assisting in cases of suffering for conscience' sake, which hath continued with great use to the society to this day. It is composed of friends under the name of correspondents, chosen by the several Quarterly-meetings, and who reside in or near the city. The same meetings also appoint members of their own in the country as correspondents, who are to join their brethren in London on emergency. The names of all these correspondents, previously to their being recorded as such, are submitted to the approbation of the Yearly-meeting. Those of the men who are approved ministers are also members of this meeting, which is called the Meeting for Sufferings; a name arising from its original purpose, which is not yet become entirely obsolete.

The Yearly-meeting has intrusted the Meeting for Sufferings with the care of printing and distributing books, and with the management of its stock;(*l*) and, considered as a standing committee of the Yearly-meeting, it hath a general care of whatever may arise, during the intervals of that meeting, affecting the society, and requiring immediate attention; particularly of those circumstances which may occasion an application to government.

There is not in any of the meetings which have been mentioned, any president, as we believe that Divine Wisdom alone ought to preside; nor hath any member a right to claim pre-eminence over the rest. The office of clerk, with a few exceptions, is undertaken voluntarily by some member; as is also the keeping of the records. Where these are very voluminous and require a house for their deposite, (as is the case in London, where the general records of the society in Great Britain are kept,) a clerk is hired to have the care of them; but except a few clerks of this kind, and persons who have the care of meeting-houses, none receive any stipend or gratuity for their services in our religious society.

Thus have we given a view of the foundation and establishment of our discipline; by which it will be seen, that it is not (as hath been frequently insinuated) merely the work of modern times; but was the early care and concern of our pious predecessors. We cannot better close this short sketch of it, than by observing, that if the exercise of discipline should in some instances appear to press hard upon those who, neglecting the monitions of divine counsel in their hearts, are also unwilling to be accountable to their brethren; yet, if that great, leading, and indispensable rule enjoined by our Lord, be observed by those who undertake to be active in it, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so them,"(*m*) it will prevent the censure of the church from falling on any thing but that which really obstructs the truth. Discipline will then promote, in an eminent degree, that love of our neighbour, which is the mark of discipleship, and without which a profession of love to God, and to his

(*l*) This is an occasional voluntary contribution, expended in printing books, house-rent for a clerk, and his wages for keeping records, the passage of ministers who visit their brethren beyond sea, and some incidental charges. (*m*) Matt. vii., 17.

cause, is a vain pretence. "He," said the beloved disciple, "that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God, love his brother also."(*n*)

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF THE MENNONITES OR ANABAPTISTS.

§ 1. The Adverse and the Prosperous Circumstances of the Mennonites.—§ 2. Union established among them.—§ 3. Sects of the Anabaptists.—§ 4. External Form of the Mennonite Church.—5. The Uckewallists.—§ 6. The Waterlanders.—§ 7. The Galenists and Apostoolians.

§ 1. The Mennonites, after numberless trials and sufferings, at length obtained in this century the much-desired peace and tranquillity; but they obtained it very slowly, and by degrees. For, although they were admitted to the privileges of citizens among the Dutch in the preceding century, yet they could not prevail on the English, the Swiss, and the Germans, either by prayers or arguments, to grant them the same privileges, nor to revise the laws in force against them. The enormities of the old Anabaptists were continually floating in the vision of the magistrates; and it did not seem to them possible, that men who hold that a Christian can never take an oath without committing great sin, and who think that Christ allows no place in his kingdom for magistrates and civil punishments, could fulfil the duties of good citizens. And hence, not a few examples may be collected from this century, of Anabaptists who were put to death, or suffered other punishments.(1) At the present time, having given numerous proofs of their probity, they live in peace, not only among the Dutch, but also among the English, the Germans, and the Prussians; and support themselves and families by their honest industry, partly as labouring men and artificers and partly by merchandise.

§ 2. The more wise among them, readily perceiving that this external peace would not be very firm and durable, unless their intestine contests and their old altercations about unimportant matters were terminated, applied themselves from time to time, with great care, to appease these discords. Nor were their efforts without effect. A large part of the Flandrians, the Germans, and the Frieslanders, renounced their contests in 1630, at Amsterdam, and entered into a union; each retaining however

(*n*) 1 John iv., 20, 21.

(1) The enactments of the Swiss against the Mennonites in this century, are stated by *Jo. Bapt. Ottius*, Annales Anabapt., p. 337, &c., and in some other places: and those of the year 1693, by *Jo. Henry Hottinger*, Schweizerische Kirchenhistorie, vol. i., p. 1101. And that in this 18th century, they have not been treated more leniently in the canton of Bern, appears from *Herm. Schyn's* Historia Mennonitar., cap. x., p. 289, &c., where may be seen letters of the States-General of the United Provinces interceding with that canton in their behalf. In the Palatinate they were grievously persecuted in 1694; when the letters of *William* III. the king of Great Britain, hushed the tempest. See *Herm. Schyn*, loc. cit., p. 265, &c. Some instances of Anabaptists being put to death in England, are mentioned by *Gilb. Burnet*, Hist. of his own Times, vol. i.

some of its peculiar sentiments. Afterwards, in 1649, the Flandrians in particular and the Germans, between whom there had formerly been much disagreement, renewed this alliance, and strengthened it with new guarantees.(2) All these Anabaptists went over to the more moderate part of the sect, and softened down and improved the old institutions of *Menno* and his successors.

§ 3. The whole sect of Anabaptists, therefore, forms at the present day two large communities; namely, the *Refined*, that is, the more strict, who are also called the *old Flemings* or *Flandrians;* and the *Gross*, that is, the more mild and lax, who are also commonly called *Waterlanders*. The reasons of these names have heretofore been given. Each of these communities is subdivided into several minor parties. The *Refined* in particular,—besides embracing the two considerable parties, of *Gröningenists*,(3) (who are so called, because they hold their stated conventions at Gröningen), and the *Dantzigers* or *Prussians*, (so named, because they have adopted the customs and church government of the Prussians),—contains a great number of smaller and more obscure parties, which disagree on various subjects and especially in regard to discipline, customs, and rules of life, and are united in nothing but in the name and in the common opinions of the early Anabaptists. All these *Refined* Anabaptists are true disciples of *Menno Simonis;* and they retain, though not all with equal strictness, his doctrines respecting the body of Christ, the washing strangers' feet as Christ enjoined, the excluding from the church and avoiding as pestilential not only sinners, but also those who even slightly deviate from the ancient simplicity and are stained with some appearance of sin.(4) At the present day, some of their congregations are altering by little and little, and slowly approximating to more moderate sentiments and discipline.

§ 4. All the Anabaptists, have first, *Bishops* or *Elders*, who uniformly preside in the consistory [or church session], and have the sole power of administering baptism and the Lord's Supper; secondly, *Teachers*, who preach to the congregation; and lastly, *Deacons* and *Deaconesses*. The ministry [or church session], by which the church is governed, is composed of these three orders. The more weighty affairs are proposed and discussed, in assemblies of the brethren. All ecclesiastical officers are chosen by the suffrages of the brethren; and, except the deacons, are ordained by prayers and the imposition of hands.

§ 5. Among the minor parties of the more strict [or *Refined*] Anabaptists, that which has obtained the greatest celebrity, bears the name of *Ukewallists* or *Ockwallists*, from *Uke Walles*, a Frieslander, its founder. This rustic and very illiterate man not only wished to have the whole ancient and severe discipline of *Menno* retained entire and unaltered, but also taught in the year 1637, in company with *John Leus*, that there is reason to hope for the salvation of *Judas* and the others, who laid violent hands on our Saviour. To give some plausibility and importance to this error, he pretended that the period between the birth of our Saviour and the descent of the Holy Ghost, which divides as it were the Old Testament from

(2) *Herman Schyn*, Plenior deductio Historiæ Mennonit., p. 41, 42.

(3) [The *Gröningenists* or old Flemings have gradually laid aside their ancient strictness, both in regard to church discipline and the practice of rebaptizing. At present, they think and teach, just as in the general Anabaptist church. This is a note of the Dutch translator of this History.—*Tr.*]

(4) See *Simeon Fred Rues*, Nachrichten von dem gegenwärtigen Zustande der Mennoniten; Jena, 1743, 8vo.

the New, was a time of darkness and ignorance, during which the Jews were destitute of all light and divine assistance; and hence he would infer, that the sins and wickedness they committed during this period, were in a great measure excusable, and could not merit severe punishment from the justice of God. Neither the Mennonites, nor the magistrates of Gröningen could endure this fiction; the former excommunicated him, and the latter banished him from the city. He removed therefore into the adjacent province of East Friesland; and collected a large number of disciples, whose descendants still remain in the territory of Gröningen, and in Friesland, Lithuania, and Prussia, and hold their meetings separate from the other Mennonites.(5) Whether they still profess that sentiment which brought so much trouble upon their master, does not appear; for they have very little intercourse with other people. But it is certain, that they tread the most faithfully of all, in the steps of *Menno* their common preceptor, and exhibit as it were a living picture of the first age of Mennonitism.(6) If any one joins them from other sects of Christians, they baptize him anew. Their dress is rustic, nay worse than rustic; for they will tolerate no appearance or shadow of elegance and ornament. Their beard is long; their hair uncombed; their countenance very gloomy; and their houses and furniture, only such as absolute necessity demands. Whoever deviates in the least from this austerity, is forthwith excommunicated; and is shunned by all, as a pest. Their *bishops* or overseers of the church, who are different from their teachers, must be approved by all their congregations. Washing of feet, they regard as a divine rite. They can the more easily keep up this discipline, as they carefully provide, that not a breath of science or learning shall contaminate their pious ignorance.

§ 6. The *Gross* or more moderate Anabaptists, consist of the Waterlanders, Flandrians, Frisians, and Germans, who entered into the union already mentioned. They are generally called *Waterlanders*. They have forsaken the more rigid and singular opinions of *Menno*, (whom, however, most of them respect and venerate), and have approximated to the customs and opinions of other Christians. They are divided into two communities, the *Frieslanders* and the *Waterlanders;* neither of which has any bishops, but only *Elders* and *Deacons*. Each congregation is independent, and has its own consistory, composed of the *Elders* and *Deacons*. But the supreme power belongs to the people; without

(5) [It is incorrect to represent the followers of *Uckewalles* as constituting a particular sect, bearing the name of *Uckewallists* or *Œckewallists*. He was merely a preacher among the old *Flemings*. He may have found some individual persons, that would profess his doctrines; but there is no evidence before us, that his particular opinions were embraced by any congregation whatever, and much less by the whole party of the old Flemings, or by any considerable part of it. Besides, his doctrines have been unknown among them, now for many years. "I testify, (writes one of their teachers,) that it is not known to me, that there is now any church or congregation among the Mennonites, either here in East Friesland, or any where else, that has received or professed these particular and absurd opinions." *H. Wærma* beknopt Ontwerp, in the Preface, § 24, Emden, 1744, 8vo. So the *Œckewallists* as they are called, or the Gröningensians and old Flemings, are no longer particular sects among the Baptists. See also note (3) above. This likewise is a note of the Dutch Translator of Mosheim.—*Tr.*]

(6) *Jo Bapt. Ottius*, Annales Anabaptist., p. 266. *Herman Schyn*, Plenior deductio Histor. Mennonit., p. 43. *Joach. Christ. Jehring*, Diss. de Ukonis Walles vita et fatis; in the Biblioth. Bremensis Theol. Philol., tom. viii., p. 113, and the Preface to the History of the Mennonites, (in German,) p. 11, &c., and the Appendix to the same, p. 234, &c.

whose consent, no business of great importance is transacted. Their elders are learned men; some of them doctors of physic, and others masters of arts. And they now support a professor at Amsterdam, who teaches both theology and the sciences.

§ 7. One of these communities of *Waterlanders*,(7) in the year 1664, became split into two parties; which still continue, and which bear the names of *Galenists* and *Apostoolians*, from the names of their [first] teachers. *Galenus Abrahams de Haan*, a doctor of physic and a minister among the Mennonites at Amsterdam, a man whom even his enemies applaud for his eloquence and penetration, taught in accordance with the views of the Arminians, that the Christian religion was not so much a body of truths to be believed, as of precepts to be obeyed; and he would have admission to the church and to the title and privileges of brethren, be open to all persons, who merely believed the books of the Old and New Testaments to be divinely inspired, and lived pure and holy lives. He adopted this principle, because he himself entertained different views from the other Mennonites, respecting the divine nature of Jesus Christ, and the redemption of the human race by his merits and death, and was inclined to the side of the Socinians.(8) Besides others who appeared against him, *Samuel Apostool* who was likewise a distinguished minister of the church at Amsterdam, very strenuously defended not only the sentiments held by most of the Mennonites in common with other Christians, respecting the divinity of our Saviour, and the influences of his death, but also the well-known peculiar sentiment of this sect respecting the visible church of Christ on earth.(9) The consequence of this contest, was a schism, which some prudent and influential men still labour in vain to remove. The *Galenists* are equally ready, with the Arminians, to admit all sorts of persons into their church, who call themselves Christians; and they are the only Anabaptists [in Holland], who refuse to be called *Mennonites*. The *Apostoolians* admit none to membership, who do not profess to believe the doctrines contained in the public formula of their religion.(10)

(7) [This is either a mistake or a slip of the pen in *Dr. Mosheim*. This schism did not occur in the community of the *Waterlanders*, but in that of the *Flemings*; and among them, only at *Amsterdam*. The church of the Flemings at Amsterdam, in which were the two preachers *Galenus Abrahams de Haan* and *Samuel Apostool*, became at this time divided. Some years afterwards, the *Waterlander* church in the above-named city, united with the *Galenists*. Such is the note of the Dutch translator of this work.—*Tr.*]

(8) [*Galenus Abrahams* was accused of this, by his opposers. The Court of Holland (the States-General) investigated the subject, and acquitted this minister, on the 14th of September, 1663. See *Wagenaer*, Amsterdam, pt. ii., p. 195 and 237. Note of the Dutch translator.—To the history of the Orthodox or Non-Remonstrant Mennonites, belongs, The Faith of the true Mennonites or Baptists, gathered from their public Confessions, by *Cornelius Ris*, minister of the Mennonites at Hoorn; with an explanatory Introduction and Appendix; Hamburg 1776, 4to, (in German). This is properly a translation of the Dutch original, which was published in 1773. It exhibits many correct views in genuine Christianity, in both its theoretical and practical parts; and is free from the doctrine, which is peculiar only to some of the Mennonites, respecting the origin of Christ's human nature. Note of the Dutch translator.—*Tr.*]

(9) See, respecting both [these men], *Herman Schyn's* Deductio plenior Historiæ Mennonit., cap. xv., p. 318, and cap. xviii., p. 237.

(10) *Casper Commelin*, Description of the city of Amsterdam, (in Dutch), vol. i., p. 500, &c. *Stoupa*, La Religion des Hollandois, p. 20, &c. *Henry Lewis Benthem's* Holländischer Schul-und Kirchenstaat, pt. i., ch. xix., p. 830. [As this chapter of *Dr. Mosheim's* history embraces only the Dutch Baptists, or *Mennonites*; it seems proper to add here a brief narrative of

the English Baptists.—Most of the *Anabaptists* mentioned in English history, prior to the reign of *James* I., appear to have been either Dutch and other foreign Anabaptists, who endeavoured to establish themselves in England, or small companies of converts made by them in the country. Yet there were probably many individuals among the people, who questioned, or denied, the propriety of infant baptism; and there are some intimations of attempts by such persons, to hold conventicles, in the latter part of the reign of *Elizabeth*. But the first regular congregation of English Baptists, appears to have originated from certain English Puritans, who returned from Holland after the death of their pastor, Rev. *John Smith*, who died in 1610. See above, note (35), p. 219. These were *General* or *Arminian Baptists*; and may be supposed to have derived many of their opinions from the Mennonites. From this time onward, churches of General Baptists were formed here and there, in different parts of England. But in general, they made no great figure, and do not appear to have had much connexion, or to have professed one uniform faith.—The *Particular* or *Calvinistic Baptists* trace their origin to a congregation of *Independents*, established in London in the year 1616. This congregation having become very large, and some of them differing from the others on the subject of infant baptism, they agreed to divide. Those who disbelieved in infant baptism were regularly dismissed, in 1633, and formed into a new church, under Rev. *John Spilsbury*. In 1638, several more members were dismissed to Mr. Spilsbury's church. And in 1639, a new Baptist church was formed Churches of Particular Baptists now multiplied rapidly. In 1646, there were forty-six in and about London. They published a confession of their faith in 1643, which was reprinted in 1644 and 1646; and which was revised in 1689, by a convention of elders and delegates from more than one hundred churches in England and Wales. Besides these, there were at that time, several churches of Calvinistic Baptists, who held to open communion, especially in Bedfordshire, where *John Bunyan* preached. There were also some *Seventh-Day Baptists*. Baptist churches were also planted in Ireland, in the times of the civil wars; and *Roger Williams* established a Baptist church in Providence in 1639, which was the commencement of this denomination in America.—When *Cromwell* had usurped the government, he dismissed the principal officers of the army, alleging, among other reasons, that they were all Anabaptists. Yet during his administration they had full toleration: indeed his *tryers* admitted a number of their preachers to become parish ministers of England. On the restoration of *Charles* II. in 1660, the Baptists, with all other Nonconformists, were exposed to great troubles and persecutions; and at the revolution in 1688, they as well as the other dissenters, obtained free toleration. Among the English Baptists of this century, there were some men of education; but the greater part of their preachers were not men of learning. The Particular Baptists, at their general convention in 1689, made arrangements for the better education of young men for their pulpits: and from their provisions originated afterwards, the famous Baptist Academy at Bristol. Before the erection of regular Baptist congregations, and indeed for some time after, it was very common for Baptists and others to belong to the same church, and to worship and commune together. From their first rise, the Baptists were assailed for holding only to adult baptism, and that by immersion; and they were not backward to defend themselves. The severest conflict of the Particular Baptists, was with the Quakers, in the time of *William Penn*. One of their writers made statements, for which the Quakers accused him of falsehood; which caused violent animosities, and much mutual crimination. The Particular Baptists had also controversies among themselves. One was, respecting their practice of *confirmation*, or imposing hands on those newly baptized. Another related to the propriety of admitting *singing*, as a part of their public worship.—The *Particular Baptists* scarcely differed at all, from the *Independents*, except on the mode and subjects of baptism. The *General Baptists* having no bond of union among themselves, held a considerable diversity of opinions; and as they did not set forth full and explicit accounts of their faith, it is impossible to characterize them, otherwise than by saying, they in general laid little stress on doctrines, and allowed very great liberty of opinion.—See *Crosby's* History of the Baptists. *Benedict's* General History of the Baptists, vol. i., ch. v. *Toulmin's* Supplements to *Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. ii., p. 169, &c.; vol. iii., p. 543, &c.; vol. iv., p. 308, &c., 493, &c.; vol. v., p. 115, &c., 239, &c. *Bogue* and *Bennet's* History of Dissenters, vol. i., p. 147, &c.—*Tr.*]

CHAPTER VI.

HISTORY OF THE SOCINIANS AND ARIANS.

§ 1. Flourishing State of the Socinians.—§ 2. Socinians at Altorf.—§ 3. Adversities of the Polish Socinians.—§ 4, 5. Fate of the Exiles.—§ 6. The Arians.

§ 1. The Socinian community, at the commencement of this century, seemed in many respects to stand on a firm basis. For they not only enjoyed the fullest religious liberty in Transylvania and at Luzko [in Volhinia], but they had in Poland, a distinguished school at Rakow, furnished with teachers eminent for learning and talents, a printing establishment, numerous congregations, and many patrons who were men of the highest rank. Elated with this prosperity, they thought proper to make great efforts to extend their church, or to obtain friends and patrons in other countries. And it may be shown by numerous proofs, that emissaries of the Polish Socinians, in the beginning of this century, were active in Holland, England, Germany, and Prussia, and that they endeavoured to make proselytes among the great and the learned. For while most other sects endeavour first to make friends among the common people, this sect, which exalts reason alone, has the peculiarity that it does not much seek the favour and friendship of women, the illiterate, and persons of inferior rank, but labours to recommend itself especially to persons of high rank and eminent talents.

§ 2. Though these missions were for the most part committed to men of birth and genius, yet their results, in most places, did not answer the expectations of their projectors. No where did there seem to be a greater prospect of success, than in the university of Altorf in the territory of Nuremberg. For here *Ernest Sohner*, a physician and Peripatetic philosopher, a man of great acuteness and subtilty, and a professor of philosophy, who had joined the Socinians while he resided in Holland, found it the more easy to instil into the minds of his hearers the doctrines of his new brethren, because he was in high reputation for learning and genuine piety. But after his death in 1612, this new Socinian party, being deprived of their guide and head, could not manage their affairs so craftily as to elude the vigilance of the other professors in the university. Hence, the whole matter being fully exposed in 1616, this already mature and daily increasing pest was suddenly arrested and destroyed, by the zealous and dexterous severity of the Nuremberg magistrates. The foreigners who were infected with the heresy, saved themselves by flight; the infected citizens of Nuremberg, allowed themselves to be reclaimed, and returned to correct principles.(1)

(1) A very full and learned history of this whole business, derived chiefly from unpublished documents and papers, was drawn up by a late divine of the university of Altorf, *Gustavus George Zeltner*, entitled Historia Crypto Socinismi Altorfinæ quondam Academiæ infesti arcana; which was published by *Gebauer*, Leipsic, 1729, 2 vols. 4to. [*Sohner* kept up a brisk correspondence with the Polish Socinians; who sent a number of Polish youth to Altorf, with their private tutors, to aid in spreading Socinian principles. It was intended, not only to diffuse these principles in and around Altorf, but to

§ 3. Neither could the Socinian sect long hold that high ground, which they appeared to occupy in Poland.(2) The chief pillar that supported it, was removed in the year 1638, by a decree of the Polish diet. For in this year, some students of the school at Rakow wantonly threw stones at a wooden statue of our Saviour extended on the cross, and demolished it. For this offence the papists took such severe revenge, that they procured the fatal law to be enacted at Warsaw, which commanded the school at Rakow to be broken up, the instructers to be banished in disgrace, the printing establishment to be destroyed, and the Socinian church to be shut up. All this was executed forthwith, and without abatement, in spite of all the efforts which the powerful patrons of the sect could put forth.(3) This first calamity was the harbinger of that dire tempest, which twenty years after entirely prostrated the glory and prosperity of the sect. For in a diet at Warsaw in 1658, all the Socinians dispersed throughout Poland, were commanded to quit the country; and it was made a capital offence, either to profess their doctrines, or to harbour others who professed them. Three years were allowed the proscribed, in which to dispose of their property and settle their affairs. But soon after, the cruelty of their enemies reduced it to two years. Finally, in the year 1661, the tremendous edict was renewed; and all the Socinians that remained, were most inhumanly driven from Poland, with immense loss not merely of property, but also of the health and the lives of many persons.(4)

§ 4. A part of the exiles took their course towards Transylvania: and nearly all these perished by diverse calamities.(5) Others were dispersed in the provinces adjacent to Poland, Silesia, Brandenburg, and Prussia; where their posterity still remain, scattered here and there. A considerable number of the more respectable families settled for a time at Creutzburg in Silesia, under the protection of the duke of Brieg.(6) Others went to more distant countries, Holland, England, Holstein, and Denmark, to see if they could obtain a comfortable settlement for themselves and their brethren. The most active and zealous in such embassies, was, *Stanislaus Lubieniezky*, a very learned Polish knight, who rendered himself acceptable to great men by his eloquence, politeness, and sagacity. In the years 1661 and 1662, he came very near to obtaining a secure residence for the Socinians at Altona, from *Frederic* III. king of Denmark; and in 1662, at Frederickstadt, from *Christ. Albert*, duke of Holstein; and at Manheim, from *Charles Lewis*, the elector Palatine. But all his efforts and expecta-

communicate them also to other German universities. See *Schroeckh's* Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, vol. v., p. 625, &c.—*Tr.*]

(2) On the flourishing state of the Socinian cause, and especially of the Racovian school, under the rectorship of *Martin Ruarus*, see *Jo. Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. i., p. 572; in his life of *Ruarus*, a very learned man of Holstein, who, it appears, had embraced Socinianism.

(3) Epistola de Wissowatii vita, in *Sand's* Bibliotheca Antitrinitaria, p. 233. *Gust. Geo. Zeltner's* Historia Crypto-Socinismi Altorfini, vol. i., p. 299.

(4) *Stanisl. Lubieniezky*, Historia Reform. Polonicæ, lib. iii., cap. xvii., xviii., p. 279, &c. Equitis Poloni Vindiciæ pro Unitarior. in Polonia religionis libertate; in *Sand's* Biblioth. Antitrinit., p. 267, and many others.

(5) [Some say there were 380 of these refugees; others say, 500. On the borders of Hungary, they were assaulted and plundered, so that when they arrived at Clausenburg in Transylvania, they were almost naked. Disease now attacked them, and carried them nearly all off. See *J. G. Walch's* Einleit. in die Rel. Streit. aus d. Ev. Luth. Kirche., vol. iv., p. 275.—*Von Einem*]

(6) *Lubieniezky*, Historia Reform. Polon., cap. xviii., p. 285, where there is quite a long Epistle of the Creutzburgers.

tions were frustrated, by the remonstrances and entreaties of theologians, in Denmark, by *John Suaning*, bishop of Seeland; in Holstein, by *John Reinboth*, the general superintendent; in the Palatinate, by *John Lewis Fabricius*, [doctor and professor of theology at Heidelberg].(7) The others who undertook such negotiations, had much less success than he: nor could any nation of Europe be persuaded, to allow the opposers of Christ's divinity freely to practice their worship among them.

§ 5. Such therefore as remain of this unhappy people, live concealed in various countries of Europe, especially in Brandenburg, Prussia, England, and Holland; and hold here and there clandestine meetings for worship: in England however, it is said they have public religious meetings, with the connivance of the magistrates.(8) Some have united themselves with the *Arminians*, and others with those Mennonites who are called *Galenists*: for neither of these sects requires its members very explicitly to declare their religious belief. It is also said, that not a few of these dispersed people are members of the society who bear the name of *Collegi-*

(7) See *Sand's* Bibliotheca Antitrinit., p. 165. The Life of *Lubieniczky*, prefixed to his Historia Reformat. Polonicæ, p. 7, 8. *Jo. Möller's* Introductio in Historiam Cherson. Cimbricæ, pt. ii., p. 105, and Cimbria Litterata, tom. ii., p. 487, &c. *Jo. Henr. Heidegger's* Life of *Jo. Lewis Fabricius*, subjoined to the works of the latter, p. 38.

(8) The Socinians residing in Brandenburg were accustomed, a few years ago, to meet at stated times at Königswald, a village near Frankfort on the Oder. See *Jourdain*, (for he is the author of the paper), Recueil de Litterature, de philosophie, et de Histoire, p. 44, Amsterd., 1731, 8vo. They also published at Berlin in 1716, a German Confession of their faith; which, with a confutation of it, is printed in den Theologischen Heb-Opfern, pt. x., p. 852. [In Prussian Brandenburg they found some protection, under the kindness of the electoral stadtholder, *Bogislaus* prince von Radzivil, who retained some Socinians at his court; and perhaps they would also have obtained religious freedom, under the electoral prince, *Frederic William*, had not the states of the duchy insisted on their expulsion. See *Fred. Sam. Bock's* Historia Socinianismi Prussici, p. 55, &c., and *Hartknoch's* Preussische Kirchenhistorie, p 646, &c. By the indulgence of the above-named electoral prince, they obtained religious freedom in Brandenburg, particularly in New Mark, under the hope that this little company would gradually unite itself with the Protestant churches. They likewise had churches and schools, at Landsberg, down to the end of the seventeenth century. After that, they were expelled; the protection of the Schwerin family, which they had hitherto enjoyed, now ceasing.—In *Holland*, the book of *John Volkel*, a Socinian, de vera Religione, 1642, was burned; and the states of Holland, in 1653, forbid the publication of Unitarian books, and all religious meetings of Socinians. Yet *Andrew Wissowatius* procured the famous Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum to be printed at Amsterdam; though the place is not mentioned on the title-page: and the Socinians have been allowed to reside there; but without the public exercise of their religion. Many of them likewise are concealed among the Mennonites, and the other sects.—*Schl.* "The Socinians in *England* have never made any figure as a *community*, but have rather been dispersed among that great variety of sects, that have arisen in a country, where liberty displays its most glorious fruits, and at the same time exhibits its most striking inconveniences. Besides, few ecclesiastics or writers of any note have adopted the theological system, now under consideration, in all its branches. The Socinian doctrine relating to the design and efficacy of the death of Christ had indeed many abettors in England, during the seventeenth century; and it may be presumed without temerity, that its votaries are rather increased than diminished, in the present; but those divines who have abandoned the *Athanasian* hypothesis, concerning the Trinity of persons in the Godhead, have more generally gone into the *Arian* and *Semiarian* notions of that inexplicable subject, than into those of the *Socinians*, who deny that Jesus Christ existed before his appearance in the human nature. The famous *John Biddle*, after having maintained both in public and private during the reign of Charles I. and the protectorship of Cromwell, the *Unitarian* system, erected an Independent congregation in London, which is the only British church we have heard of, in which all the peculiar doctrines of Socinianism were inculcated."—*Macl.*]

ants. Being thus situated, they have not all been able to maintain that form of religion, which their fathers transmitted to them. Accordingly, both the learned and the unlearned, without restraint, explain variously those doctrines which distinguish them from other sects: yet they all agree in denying the divine Trinity, and the divinity and atonement of our Saviour.(9)

§ 6. Kindred with the Socinians, are the *Arians;* some of whom obtained celebrity in this century as authors, such as *Christopher Sand*, father and son, and *John Biddle*;(10) and likewise some of those comprehended under the general appellation of *Anti-Trinitarians* or *Unitarians*. For this [latter] name is applied to various sorts of persons, who agree in this only, that they will not admit of any real distinction in the divine nature. The name of *Arians* is likewise given to all those in general, who represent our Saviour to be inferior to God the Father. And as this may be done in various ways, it is manifest that this word, as now used, must have various significations; and that all, who are now called *Arians*, do not agree with the ancient Arians; nor do they all hold one and the same sentiment.

(9) This is evident from many proofs, and among others from the example of *Samuel Crell*, the most learned man among the Socinians a few years since; who, although he sustained the office of a teacher among them, yet deviated in many respects from the doctrines of *Socinus* and of the Racovian catechism; nor did he wish to be called a *Socinian*, but an *Artemonite*. See Journal Litteraire, tome xvii., part i., p 150, and my own remarks on this man, in my Syntagma Diss. ad sanctiores disciplinas pertinentium, p. 352. Unschuldige Nachrichten, 1750, p. 942. Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. Crit., tome ii., pt. ii., p. 88, &c.

(10) Of both the *Sands*, *Arnold* [Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie, vol. ii., book xvii., ch. xiii., § 25, p. 176, &c.], and others give account. Respecting *Biddle*, see Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist Crit., tome i., pt. ii., p. 288, &c. [*Christopher Sandius* the elder, was of Creuzberg in Prussia, studied law, and filled various offices at Königsberg; but was deprived in 1668, because he would not renounce Arianism. After this, he lived in retirement, and wrote only some vindications and apologies. Yet he aided his son in the composition of his works; and outliving him, published some of them after his death. The son called himself *Christopher Christopheri Sandius;* and wrote, besides his Biblioth. Antitrinitariorum, his Nucleus Historiæ ecclesiast. on the four first centuries; in which he attempts to prove, that the early fathers, before the council of Nice, held Arian sentiments; and that *Athanasius* was the first that broached the common belief among Christians respecting the Trinity. He also wrote Interpretationes paradoxas quatuor Evangeliorum; de Origine animæ; Problema paradoxum de Spiritu Sancto; and, (under the name of *Herm. Cingallus*), Scriptura Trinitatis Revelatrix. The son died in 1680, (aged 40), and the father in 1686.—*Schl.* See also, concerning the younger *Sand*, *Rees'* Cyclopædia, art. *Sandius*.—*John Biddle* was born in 1615, educated at Oxford, and became master of a free school in Gloucester in 1641. Here he soon became suspected of heresy; and from the year 1644, till his death in 1662, he passed a large part of his time in various prisons, and in exile. Whenever he was at liberty, he wrote and preached in favour of his sentiments; which caused him to be frequently apprehended, and to undergo a criminal prosecution. In the year 1651, he published two Catechisms; in which, Mr. *Neal* says, he maintained, 1. "That God is confined to a certain place. 2. That he has a bodily shape. 3. That he has passions. 4. That he is neither omnipotent nor unchangeable. 5. That we are not to believe, three persons in the Godhead. 6. That Jesus Christ has not the nature of God, but only a divine lordship. 7. That he was not a priest while upon earth. 8. That there is no deity in the Holy Ghost." According to Dr. *Toulmin*, these are not formal *propositions*, but only *questions* in his catechisms; to which he subjoins texts of scripture by way of answer. Thus, the first proposition is this question: "Is not God, according to the current of the scripture, in a certain place, namely, in heaven?" The answer consists of twenty-nine passages of scripture, which represent God, as "looking from heaven," as "our father who art in heaven," &c. See *Neal's* Hist. of the Puritans, vol. iv., p. 157, &c., ed. Boston, 1817. *Toulmin's* Review of the Life, Character, and Writings of Mr. John Biddle. *Brook's* Lives of the Puritans, vol. iii., p. 411. &c. *Rees'* Cyclopædia, art. *Biddle.—Tr.*]

CHAPTER VII.

HISTORY OF SOME MINOR SECTS.

§ 1, 2. The Collegiants.—§ 3. The Labadists.—§ 4. Bourignon and Poiret.—§ 5. The Philadelphian Society.

§ 1. It will be proper here to give some account of certain sects, which could not be conveniently noticed in the history of the larger communities, but which, for various reasons, should not be passed over in total silence. While the Arminian disputes in Holland were most warm, in the year 1619, arose that class of people, who hold sacred conventions twice a year at *Rheinsberg* in Holland, not far from Leyden, and who are well known by the name of *Collegiants*. The institution oiginated from three brothers, by the name of *Koddeus* or *Van der Kodde*; namely *John James, Hadrian,* and *Gisbert;* obscure men, in rural life, but according to report, pious, well acquainted with their Bibles, and opposed to religious controversies. They were joined by one *Anthony Cornelius,* who was also an illiterate and obscure man. The descendants and followers of these men acquired the name of *Collegiants,* from the circumstance, that they called their assemblies *Colleges.* All persons may be admitted into the society, who merely account the Bible a divine book, and endeavour to live according to its precepts, whatever may be their opinions respecting God and the Christian religion. The brethren, who are considerably numerous in most of the cities and villages of Holland, Friesland, and West Friesland, assemble twice a week, namely on Sundays and Wednesdays; and after singing a hymn, and offering a prayer, they take up some passage of the New Testament, which they illustrate and explain. With the exception of females whom they do not allow to speak in public, all persons of whatever rank or order, are at liberty to bring forward their thoughts, and offer them to the consideration of the brethren: and all are at liberty to oppose, modestly and soberly, whatever the brethren advance. They have printed lists of the texts of scripture which are to be discussed at their several meetings, so that each person may examine the passages at home, and come prepared to speak. Twice a year the brethren assemble at Rheinsberg, where they have spacious buildings, destined for the education of orphan children, and for the reception of strangers; and there spend four days together, in listening to exhortations to holiness and love, and in celebrating the Lord's supper. Here also, such as wish it, are baptized; but it is in the ancient manner, immersing the whole body in water. The brethren of Friesland, at the present day, assemble once a year at Leeuwarden, and there observe the holy supper; because Rheinsberg is too distant for them conveniently to go thither. In short; by the *Collegiants,* we are to understand a very large society of persons of every sect and rank, who assume the name of Christians, but entertain different views of Christ; and which is kept together, neither by rulers and teachers, nor by ecclesiastical laws, nor by a formula of faith, nor lastly, by any set of rites, but solely by the desire of improvement in scriptural knowledge and piety.(1)

(1) See the Dissertation sur les Usages de ceux qu'on appelle en Hollande Collegiens et Rhinobourgeois; which is in the splendid work: Ceremonies religieuses de tous

§ 2. In such an association, which allows all its members to think as they please, and which has no formula of faith, dissensions and controversies cannot easily arise. Yet in the year 1672, there was no little dispute between *John* and *Paul Breitenburg*, merchants of Rotterdam, and *Abraham Lemmermann* and *Francis Cuiper*, merchants of Amsterdam. *John Breitenburg*, (or *Bredenburg*, as he is generally called), had established a peculiar sort of *college*, in which he expounded the religion of reason and nature. This was disapproved of by *Lemmermann* and *Cuiper*, who wished to have reason excluded from any combination with religion. The dispute grew warmer, as *Bredenburg* diverged towards the opinions of *Spinoza* and defended them, and yet wished to be regarded as a Christian.(2) Some other minor contests arose at the same time. The result of the whole was, that the *Collegiants* in 1686, were split into two opposing sects, and held their conventions in separate edifices at Rheinsberg. But on the death of the authors of these discords, near the beginning of the next century, the schism began to heal, and the *Collegiants* returned to their former union and harmony.(3)

§ 3. *John Labadie*, a Frenchman, eloquent, and of no contemptible genius, was first a Jesuit; being dismissed from their society, he joined the Reformed, and sustained the office of a preacher with reputation, in France, Switzerland, and Holland. He at length set up a new sect, which had its seat first at Middleburg in Zealand, then at Amsterdam. and afterwards, in 1670, at Hervorden a town in Westphalia, under the patronage of *Elizabeth* princess Palatine, the abbess of Hervorden; and being driven from that place, it removed to Altona in 1672; and, on the death of its founder in 1674, retired to the castle of Wiewert in West Friesland; but it has long since become extinct. This sect was joined not only by several men

les peuples du monde, tome iv., p. 323, &c. Also a book, published by the Collegiants themselves, entitled: De Oorspronck, Natuur, Handelwize en Oogmerk der zo genaamde Rynburgsche Vergadering, Amsterd, 1736, 4to.

(2) *John Bredenburg* and *Francis Cuiper*, are well known to have been among the followers and the adversaries of *Spinoza;* but what sort of men they were, has been unknown generally. *Bredenburg*, a Collegiant and a merchant of Rotterdam, openly taught the doctrine of *Spinoza*, and demonstrated its accordance with reason, mathematically. At the same time, he not only professed to be a Christian, but actually explained, recommended, and defended Christianity in the meetings of the Collegiants, and declared it to be of divine origin. This man of a singular genius reconciled these two contradictory things, by maintaining that reason was opposed to religion; but yet, that we ought to believe in the religion contained in the N. Testament scriptures, against the most evident and the most conclusive mathematical demonstrations. He must therefore have believed in a twofold truth, theological and mathematical; and have held *that* to be false in theology, which is true in philosophy. The best account of *Bredenburg*, is given by the learned Jew, *Isaac Orobio*, in his Certamen philosophicum propugnatæ veritatis divinæ et naturalis adversus Jo. Bredenburgii principia, ex quibus quod religio rationi repugnat, demonstrare nititur. This book, which contains *Bredenburg's* demonstrations of the doctrines of Spinoza, was first published, Amsterdam, 1703, 8vo, and then, Brussels, 1731, 12mo. *Bredenburg's* adversary, *Francis Cuiper*, rendered his name famous by his Arcana Atheismi detecta, written in opposition to Bredenburg. *Cuiper* was a bookseller of Amsterdam, and published among other things, the Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum seu Unitariorum. Those acquainted with literary history, know that *Cuiper*, on account of that very book above mentioned which he wrote against *Bredenburg*, became suspected of *Spinozism;* notwithstanding he was a *Collegiant*, and a strenuous defender of Christianity, and of the harmony of reason with religion.

(3) Besides those already named, see *Simon Fred. Rues*, Nachrichten vom Zustande der Mennoniten, p. 267, &c.

of considerable learning, but also by that Minerva of the seventeenth century, the very learned lady of Utrecht, *Anna Maria Schurmann*. This little community did not wish to be thought to differ from the Reformed, in regard to religious opinions and doctrines, so much as in manners and rules of discipline. For its lawgiver proposed a rigorous and austere model of sanctity for his followers; and conceived that not only the invisible church, but also the visible, ought to be a community of sanctified persons, earnestly striving after perfection in holiness. Several of his tracts are extant, which show him to have possessed a lively and ardent mind, though not well disciplined and polished: and as persons of such a character are easily betrayed by their natural temperament, into errors and faults, I am not sure whether those witnesses are to be wholly disregarded, who charge his life and doctrine with many blemishes.(4)

§ 4. Nearly at the same time, *Antoinette Bourignon de la Porte*, a lady of Flanders, boasted that she was inspired of God, and instructed supernaturally to restore the Christian religion, which had become extinct and lost among the disputes and contentions of the different sects. This woman, who possessed a voluble tongue, feelings uncommonly ardent, and an imagination of inexhaustible fecundity, filled the provinces of Holland, and also Jutland (where she spent some years), with the fame of her flights of fancy; and she persuaded some among the learned, as well as the ignorant and unlearned, to believe her declarations. After various sufferings and conflicts, she died at Franeker in Friesland, in the year 1680. It would require a prophet and diviner, to make out from her numerous writings, a neat and consistent system of theology. For that divine light which guides persons of this character, never proceeds in a regular and methodical way; and it spreads a thick darkness before the minds of those who investigate truth, not by feeling, but by the understanding. Yet a reflecting person who is versed in church history, may easily discover, that this woman who had not full command of her reason, derived a large part of her oracles from the writings of the Mystic doctors; and that what she derived from these sources, the extravagance of her fancy made worse than they were before. Neglecting all the details of her system, the substance of it is, that religion consists in an internal *emotion* or sensation of the soul, and not in either knowledge or practice.(5) Among her patrons,

(4) See *Jo. Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. iii., p. 35, &c., and Isagoge ad Histor. Chersones. Cimbricæ, pt. ii., cap. v., p. 121, &c. Add *Godfr. Arnold's* Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, vol. i., pt ii., book xvii., ch. xxi., p. 1186 *Weismann's* Historia Eccl. sæculi xvii., p. 927, and others. Concerning the two celebrated companions and colleagues of Labadie, *Peter du Lignon* and *Peter Yvon*, see *Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. ii., p. 472, 1020. [*Labadie* exhibited through life, the character of an indiscreet reformer. To lash the vices of the people, and to purge the churches of their offences against purity, was his great business. But it was his misfortune always to get into difficulty The irreligious abhorred him, and the pious were dissatisfied with him. Hence he removed from place to place, was at length excommunicated by the French churches in Holland, and set up a church of his own. But this church rendered itself so odious, that it was persecuted, and driven from place to place, so long as *Labadie* was at the head of it. The charges against him were very numerous and weighty, and respected both his orthodoxy and his morals: but it is questionable whether, if fairly tried, he would be found to be any thing more than a rash, indiscreet, enthusiastical man.—*Tr.*]

(5) See *Jo. Möller*, who treats expressly and fully respecting her, in his Cimbria Litterata, tom. ii., p. 85. &c., and in his Introduct. in Histor. Chersonesi Cimbricæ, pt. ii., p. 151, &c. *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire Hist et Crit., tome i., p. 639 *Godfr. Arnold*, Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, vol. ii., p. 153, &c., and others.

the most distinguished were, *Christian Bartholomew de Cordt*, a priest of the Oratory at Mechlin, a Jansenist, who died on the island of Nordstrand in Jutland;(6) and *Peter Poiret*, a man of penetrating genius, and well versed in the Cartesian philosophy; who has clearly evinced by his own example, that knowledge and ignorance, reason and superstition, are not so mutually repulsive that they cannot reside in the same breast, and by their united energies engender monstrous productions.(7)

§ 5. Of the same or at least similar views, the same plans, and the same general character, was *Jane Leade*, who near the end of the century blinded not only many of the common people in England, but also some of the better informed, by her visions, her prophecies, her promises, and her doctrines; and thus gave rise to the *Philadelphian Society*. For she believed in general, that all contentions among Christians would wholly cease, and that the church of Christ would become the only, the perfectly united, and the most beautiful church here on earth; provided all would commit their souls to the *internal teacher*, to be moulded, enlightened, and governed by him, neglecting all other doctrines, precepts, and opinions. And she did not hesitate to give assurance, in the name of God, that such a church as she had conceived of, would be established before the end of the world. And the honest woman might with more confidence give this assurance, as she fully believed, that her Philadelphian Society was that very church of Christ, in which alone the Holy Spirit resided and reigned. Her other discoveries, among which was the noted *restoration of all things*, need not be related. *Leade* was less fortunate than *Bourignon* in this respect, that she had not so eloquent and sagacious a counsellor as *Poiret*, to plead her cause. For her principal associates, *John Pordage*, a physician, and *Thomas Bromly*, were more distinguished for piety and a contemplative turn of mind, than for their power of reasoning or their eloquence. *Pordage* in particular, even surpassed our *Bœhmen* (whom he greatly admired), in obscurity; and instead of enlightening his readers, shocks them with his uncouth phraseology.(8)

(6) See concerning him, *Möller's* Cimbria Litterata, tom. ii., p. 149.

(7) *Poiret* systematized and explained the wild and incoherent rhapsodies of *Bourignon*, in a great work which he entitled: L'Œconomie divine ou Systeme universel; first published in French, Amsterd., 1686, 7 vols. 8vo, and afterwards published in Latin. Respecting this celebrated Mystic philosopher, whose various writings procured him notoriety, see the Bibliotheca Bremens. Theol. Philol., tom. iii., pt. i., p. 75.

(8) See *Jo. Wolfg. Jaeger*, Historia sacra et civilis sæculi xvii., decenn. x., p. 90, &c. *Peter Poiret*, Bibliotheca Mysticor., p. 161, 174, 283, 286, and others. [*Jane Leade*, who died 1704, in the 81st year of her age, spent nearly her whole life in reading and recommending the writings of *Boehm*, and in penning down her own revelations and new results of divine truths. She was rich, and printed the whole at her own cost. Hence great numbers of her writings came before the public. The Philadelphian Society was established by her in 1697: the cause and reasons for its institution, she published in 1698. Her writings fill eight volumes.—*Pordage* was first a preacher, but afterwards being deposed for his fanaticism, he became a physician. He was the most zealous promoter of the Boehmist doctrines and of the Philadelphian Society in England. His principal work was, his Divine and true Metaphysics, in 3 vols. 8vo. He also wrote a Theologia Mystica; and died in 1698.—*Bromley* was his pupil and adherent, and wrote much on the Bible. In Holland, one *Lot Fisher*, a physician, was a promoter of the Philadelphian Society; and he caused all the above works to be splendidly published in Dutch.—*Schl.*]

A BRIEF SKETCH

OF THE

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

OF THE

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

§ 1. Preface.—§ 2. Prosperous Events of the Church generally, and especially of the Popish Church.—§ 3. The Jesuits and their Regulations in China.—§ 4. Protestant Missions.—§ 5. Adverse Events. Private Enemies of Christianity.—§ 6. Atheists: Deists. —§ 7. Romish Church: the Pontiffs.—§ 8. Prospects of Reconciliation between the Evangelical and the Papists frustrated.—§ 9. Intestine Discords of the Romish Church. Jansenist Contests.—§ 10. Quesnel.—The Bull Unigenitus.—§ 11. Commotions from it in France.—§ 12. Supports of the Jansenists in France. Francis de Paris.—§ 13. State of the Eastern Church.—§ 14. External State of the Lutheran Church.—§ 15. Its Internal State.—§ 16. Intestine Foes.—§ 17. The Herrenhutters. Zinzendorf.—§ 18. Cultivation of Philosophy among the Lutherans.—§ 19. The Wertheim Translation.— § 20 Pietistic Controversies.—§ 21. State of the Reformed Church.—§ 22. Projects for Union between the Lutherans and the Reformed.—§ 23. State of the English Church. —§ 24. Various Sects in England. Whitefield.—§ 25. State of the Dutch Church.— § 26 Controversy in Switzerland respecting the Formula Consensus.—§ 27. The Socinians. Arians.

§ 1. The ecclesiastical history of the [eighteenth] century now passing, affords matter for a volume, rather than for a few pages; and may expect among those who come after us, an ingenuous and faithful historian of its own. But that the present summary may not be defective, and that myself and perhaps others, may have a thread to guide our lectures, I will just run over the principal subjects, and in a few words state the occurrences most worthy of notice in our own age. That the size of the book may not be unnecessarily swelled, authorities will be omitted. For what man of learning is so ignorant of the state of literature, as not to know that there are innumerable works, from which our dry and insipid narrative might be filled out and made interesting?

§ 2. The Christian name has been propagated with equal zeal, by papists and Protestants, in Asia, America, and Africa. I say the Christian *name*, not the Christian *religion*. For it is demonstrable, that very many of those whom the Romish missionaries persuade to forsake idolatry, show themselves to be Christians only in name, and as to certain ceremonies and outward forms, not in reality and in spirit; nor do they quit superstition, but only exchange one species of it for another. Among the papists the Jesuits, and among the Jesuits the French, especially, are represented as explaining genuine Christianity, with distinguished success, to barbarous nations which knew not God. And the fact is not to be denied, provided it is allowable to call those persons Christians, who have some knowledge of Christ, however imperfect it may be. At least it is

true, that the French gathered large congregations of such Christians, in the East Indies, especially in the kingdoms of Carnate, Madura, and Maravа, on the coast of Malabar, and in China, Tonquin, and elsewhere; and also in some provinces of America, since the time that *Anthony Veri* assumed the office of superintendent of the sacred missions, and by great efforts procured both men and money adequate for so great an undertaking. But these missionaries were so far from effacing the former stain upon the character of the Jesuit preachers, that they rather deepened it. For they are represented as pursuing their own honour and emolument, rather than the interests of Christ; and as ingeniously corrupting very much the holy religion of our Saviour, in order to obtain the more proselytes.

§ 3. The famous question, whether the Jesuits residing in China, advocated the cause of Christ well or ill, among that discerning people who are so exceedingly attached to their ancient rites; was decided in the year 1704, by *Clement* XI. in a manner adverse to the Jesuits. For he declared it criminal for the new Christians to practise the rites of their ancestors; and especially those rites by which the Chinese honour their deceased ancestors and *Confucius*. But this severe edict was considerably mitigated, in the year 1715; and doubtless, for the sake of appeasing the angry Jesuits. For the pontiff decreed, that it is allowable for the teachers of the Chinese, to designate the divine nature by the word *Tien;* provided they add the word *Tchu*, to remove the ambiguity of the word *Tien*, and to make it appear that the Christian teachers adored the *Lord of heaven*, (for this is the meaning of the phrase *Tien-Tchu*), and not heaven itself. He also allowed those rites to be practised, which gave so much offence to the adversaries of the Jesuits; provided all superstition and appearance of religion were avoided, and that these rites were regarded as mere testimonies of respect for their ancestors, or as marks of civil honour. The Chinese Christians therefore, according to this decree of *Clement*, may keep in their houses tablets, on which are written in golden letters the names of their ancestors and of *Confucius:* they may lawfully honour them with lighted candles, with incense, and with tables set out with viands, fruits, and spices: nay, may address these tablets and the graves of their ancestors, as supplicants, prostrating themselves to the ground. The first or more severe edict was carried to China, by *Charles Thomas Tournon*, in the year 1705; and the second or milder one, by *Charles Ambrose Mezzabarba*, in the year 1721. But neither of them satisfied the emperor and the Jesuits. *Tournon* executing the commands of his master with less prudence than the case required, was, by order of the emperor, thrown into prison; where he died in the year 1710. *Mezzabarba*, though much more cautious and prudent, returned without effecting his object: for the emperor could by no means be persuaded, to allow any innovations to be made in the ancient customs and institutions of the country. At present, the state of Christianity in China being extremely precarious and dubious, this controversy is entirely suspended. And many considerations induce us to suppose, that the pontiff and the accusers of the Jesuits, throw no obstacles in the way of the Jesuits' adhering to their own regulations, rather than to those sent them from Rome. For many evils must be patiently borne, in order to avoid that far greater evil, the overthrow of the Romish religion in China.(1)

(1) [All these events are stated far more fully in *Dr. Mosheim's* most recent Ecclesiastical History of China, (in German), Rostock, 1748, 8vo. In opposition to this, was

§ 4. The English and the Dutch, but especially the former, made much greater efforts than before, to spread the knowledge of Christianity among the nations of Asia and America. Among the efforts of this kind by Lutherans, the noblest and most successful is, the institution of *Frederic* IV. king of Denmark; who in the year 1706, sent out missionaries to preach Christian truth to the Indians on the coast of Malabar. This mission, the purest and best of all, not only still flourishes, being supported by the very best regulations, but through the munificence of that excellent king, *Christian* VI., it is daily becoming more and more brilliant. The men who labour in it, I admit, make fewer Christians than the papal missionaries; but they make far better ones,—real disciples, and not the apes of disciples of Jesus Christ. The Russians have bestowed labour, not in vain, for the conversion of some of the nations bordering on Siberia.

§ 5. While the glory of Jesus Christ has been increasing in the remotest parts of our world, through the labours, the perils, and the anxious solicitudes of these missionaries, great numbers in Europe, have made it their business to obscure this glory and to tread it in the dust. There is no country of Europe, and almost no sect of Christians in our age, which does not nourish in its bosom persons who endeavour either to blot out all religion and all fear of God, or at least, to sink the dignity and lessen the influence of Christianity. No where does this pest to the human race more abound, no where does it more boldly come forth to the light of day, than in the free states of Holland and England. Nor is it rare to meet, especially in England, with books which impudently deride and set at naught, not only the whole religion of Christ, but also the honour, worship, and majesty of the divine Being, and all virtue and morality. Infamous for the publication of such books, are, *John Toland*, *Anthony Collins*, *Matthew Tindal*, *Thomas Woolston*, (a portentous genius, who with most stupid effrontery attempted to undermine the credibility of our Saviour's miracles), *Thomas Morgan*, *John Chubb*, *John Mandeville*, and several others. And not long will any country of Europe, particularly those which have abandoned the Romish communion, be free from writers of this character, if the booksellers continue to abuse the power they now have, of rescuing from oblivion by means of printing every wretched and senseless production.

§ 6. The sect of *Atheists*, that is, of persons who deny the existence of an infinitely wise and powerful Being, who created and upholds the visible universe according to his pleasure, is now almost extinct. For those actuated by this phrensy at the present day, omitting all disputation, agree to the doctrines of *Spinoza;* and consider this whole material world as an automaton, which by means of some internal energy originates and produces various movements, all of which are the result of necessity. The tribe of *Deists*, or of persons who assail the truth of all revealed religions, and especially of the Christian religion, disagree very much, and are divided into various sects. The best of them,—though these are bad enough,—are those who endeavour to merge Christianity in natural reli-

published at Augsburg in 1758, 8vo, and at Inspruck. The most recent events in China; with a solid confutation of many unjust and erroneous statements of *Dr. Mosheim*, in his most recent Eccl. Hist. of China; written from Pekin, by *R. P. Floriano Bahr*, then rector of the Jesuits' college in China. But this refutation only makes the correctness of *Mosheim's* book appear the more manifest —*Schl.*]

gion, maintaining that Christ only republished the lost and obliterated precepts of nature or correct reason. Of this class are *Tindal*, *Chubb*, *Mandeville*, *Morgan*, and many others among the English; if indeed, they really believed what their words express. To the same class belongs *Muralt*, or whoever may be the unfortunately eloquent and ingenious author of the recent French work, entitled: What is essential in religion, [Lettres sur la religion essentielle à l'homme, distinguée de ce qui n'en est que l'accessoire.—*Macl.*] For according to his opinion, the whole system of religion is comprised in these three propositions: There is a God: He watches over human affairs: The soul is immortal. And to inculcate these three truths, by his precepts and example, was the object of Christ's mission.

§ 7. The Romish church in this century, has been governed by *Clement* XI. [A.D. 1700–21], *Innocent* XIII. [1721–24], *Benedict* XIII. [1724–30], *Clement* XII. [1730–40], *Benedict* XIV. [1740–58]. All these may be pronounced holy, wise, and learned men, if compared with the pontiffs of former times. The most distinguished of them for learning and erudition, are *Clement* XI. and the present pontiff, *Benedict* XIV., whose former name was *Prosper de Lambertini*. The most distinguished for piety, or rather for a show of it, was *Benedict* XIII. This last-named pontiff made a laudable attempt, by means of a council which he held in the Lateran palace in 1725, the Acts and decrees of which have been published, to correct the greater evils in the church, and to reform the very corrupt morals of the clergy of every rank. But the event did not answer his expectations. Nor will *Benedict* XIV. be more successful; who is now attempting the same thing, though by different means. Moreover the modern pontiffs differ exceedingly from their predecessors, in the extent of their prerogatives and in their power and influence. For the sovereign princes and states, though they treat the pontiffs personally with high respect and honour, yet are continually depressing and humbling the *court* of Rome, which they wisely discriminate from the pontiff. This appears, among other things from the contests of the pontiffs in the present age, with the kings of France, Portugal, Sardinia, and Naples; in which the pontiffs have uniformly been obliged to succumb.

§ 8. A reconciliation of the Protestants with the papists, if we except some feeble efforts of certain individuals, has not been seriously and earnestly attempted; nor indeed was it hardly possible. For those who formerly attempted this thing, endeavoured principally to gain over the Protestants, by explaining away and lowering down the [most offensive] Romish doctrines; but *Clement* XI. deprived the pacificators of this their principal resource, by publishing that very noted decree, called the *Bull Unigenitus*. For this has shown most clearly, that on most of the points which obliged our ancestors to separate from the Romish communion, the present doctrine of the papists is precisely the same, as it formerly appeared to be. This disclosure being made, it became manifest, that those who had formerly offered us peace on very conciliatory terms, had only laid a trap for us by their pretended expositions of the Romish faith, and that no confidence whatever could be reposed on the promises of such men.

§ 9. The intestine discords, which greatly disquieted the Romish community in the preceding century, were so far from being composed and settled in this, that they have rather acquired new strength, and raged with

increased animosity. The Jesuits still contend with the Dominicans and others; though with a little more decorum, and more covertly. The Franciscans are at variance with the Dominicans. There is also dispute respecting the nature and lawfulness of the Chinese rites. But it would be endless to enumerate all the contests, which disturb and disquiet every part of the widely-extended Romish church, sometimes more slightly and sometimes more violently. The principal controversy now dividing the papal empire, seems to be that of the Jansenists; which is carried on with various results, particularly in France and the Netherlands. The Jansenists, or Augustinians as they choose to be called, are inferior to the Jesuits in numbers, power, and influence; but are their equals in fortitude, sagacity, and erudition; and their superiors in sanctimoniousness, and that superstition which dazzles the eyes of the multitude. In France they are oppressed and persecuted, but in the Netherlands they find a ready asylum. The greatest part of the papists in the Spanish Netherlands, and all those in the United Netherlands, adhere to the Jansenist doctrines. The Dutch papists at this day, have almost separated themselves from the Roman pontiff; though they profess the closest adherence to the communion of the Romish church: nor are either the threatenings or the entreaties of the Romish prelate, able to reduce these rebellious Batavians to subordination.

§ 10. A very great support to the Jansenist cause, both in the preceding century and in this, was the New Testament of the very learned and pious *Paschasius Quesnel*, one of the Presbyters of the Oratory, which he translated into French, and accompanied with notes calculated to awaken a sense of religion. For the marrow of the Jansenist doctrines is very elegantly and ingeniously wrought into these notes, so as to infuse it the more agreeably into the mind of the reader. To destroy the influence of this most pernicious engine, the Jesuits induced *Lewis* XIV. king of France, to solicit a public condemnation of the book from the Roman pontiff, *Clement* XI. The pontiff complied with the wishes of the king, or rather of the Jesuits, and issued in the year 1713, the celebrated *Bull* or decree, which from its first words is called *Unigenitus*, and in which *one hundred and one* propositions taken from that book, are proscribed. This edict was of some advantage to the cause of the Jesuits, but it was of immense disadvantage to the whole Romish church, as the wiser men in it themselves admit. For not to mention that the Protestants learned from it, that the Romish community religiously held fast her former corruptions, the subjects of the pontiff, who had no attachment to the Jansenist doctrines, and who were solicitous only to advance truth and piety, were exceedingly offended at this decree. Besides, the Jansenian schism was widened by it, and rendered more bitter and violent.

§ 11. The most violent contests were produced by this unhappy edict, especially in France. Many of the prelates and a vast number of influential, pious, and learned men, both among the clergy and the laity, appealed from it to a future general council. And especially *Lewis Anthony Noailles*, the archbishop of Paris, manfully opposed it, regardless of the resentments both of the pontiff and the king. These strenuous defenders of the Gallic liberties and of the religion of their fathers, the pontiffs, kings, and Jesuits laboured to subdue, by all sorts of punishments and indignities: and in part they did subdue them. For many became exiles, and retired among their brethren in Holland: others were coerced, by violence and

fear, to approve the decree of the pontiff: and others, being deprived of their livings, their honours, and their offices, removed to foreign countries. At length the matter was carried so far, that this papal edict was declared to be a law of the land. All these measures reduced the nation to some degree of quietude; but they by no means purged it of enemies to the pontiff. Every part of France abounds with *Appellants*, as they are called, who are only waiting for a convenient opportunity for renewing the old controversy, which has never been properly settled.

§ 12. Amid these calamities, the Jansenists had but two resources, by which to defend themselves and their cause against so many powerful enemies, namely, the press and miracles. Accordingly, they attacked the pontiff and the Jesuits in numberless publications, many of which being written with copiousness, elegance, and solidity, have produced great effect; and as human aids proved insufficient, they called in the help of divine aid. For they persuaded the people, that God had honoured the bones and ashes of certain persons, who had been distinguished for their zeal in the cause of *Jansenius*, and who had appealed anew in their last moments to a future council, by imparting to them the power of healing the most inveterate diseases. Among those who were said to have received this glory, the most distinguished was *Francis de Paris*, a deacon of the church of Paris, a man of noble birth but of a gloomy temperament, and excessively superstitious, and one who had voluntarily brought on his own death, by abstinence from food and other self tortures. To miracles, were superadded divine visions. For many persons especially at Paris, pretended to be actuated by the Holy Spirit, and uttered prophecies, often of the most insipid character, by which however the multitude as is usual, were greatly affected. But the prudence of the French court put an end to these commotions also: so that as things now are, the Jansenists have no other means of defence, but their genius and their pens.

§ 13. Of the Greek and Oriental church, very little can be said. For their ignorance and the severe oppression under which they live, prevent their attempting any revolution or change of condition. The Russians as already stated, under the guidance of the emperor *Peter* the Great, adopted better regulations for their church. Yet there still remain vast numbers in that immense empire, who would be better pleased with the rude system of their ancestors: and there are some, who if they were able, would exterminate the Protestants and the followers of other religions, with fire and sword. This is manifest, especially, from a work of *Stephen Javorski* against the heretics. The Greeks are said to meet with more indulgence from their Mohammedan masters. The Nestorians and Monophysites in Asia and Africa, perseveringly refuse communion with the Romish see, notwithstanding all the promises and arguments of the papal missionaries. The pontiffs have several times contemplated a new mission to the Abyssinians; but have not yet been able to discover a way to elude the vigilance of that nation, so hostile to the Romish religion. Nor is there even a tolerable prospect, that the embassy now preparing at Rome to the emperor of Abyssinia, will meet with success. The Monophysites in Asia extend the limits of their church, as they have opportunity; and not long since, they gained over a part of the Nestorians inhabiting the maritime coasts of India.

§ 14. The Lutheran church celebrated, in peace and tranquillity, the

secular festival of its religion in 1717, and that of the Augsburg Confession in 1730. It received no small accession a few years since, by means of that multitude which abandoned the territories of Saltzburg and Berchtolsgadden, in order to profess the pure religion without fear, and emigrated, some to Prussia, others to Holland, and others to America and other countries. The Lutheran church has likewise been increased, in consequence of its extension to America and Asia; nor are the Lutheran congregations small in those distant regions. In Germany, on the other hand, as appears from the public documents and from numerous complaints, it has in various places been much oppressed by the adherents to the Roman pontiff, and been very unjustly deprived of a part of its privileges.

§ 15. No change could take place in the doctrines and regulations of the Lutheran church; because the ancient confessions and canons by which the public faith and discipline were ascertained, remained as formerly. But the method of teaching and inculcating these doctrines, was not uniformly the same. At the commencement of the century, it seemed very generally to be the aim, to restore every part of Christianity to its ancient simplicity; and to exclude all philosophical terms and reasonings. But in process of time many fell into the opinion, that Christianity could by no means maintain its ground, unless it was supported by the aids of philosophy, and was demonstrated mathematically. The jurists, who in the preceding century undertook to reform the system of ecclesiastical law, have prosecuted the object so vigorously in the present century, that we should have had a very different ecclesiastical constitution, if the sovereigns had deemed it for the public good to yield to their counsels and admonitions. Still we may discover here and there visible traces of the principles, which men of great learning are wont to advance, not only respecting the appendages and externals of religion, but also respecting religion itself. Hence it is not strange, that there should be warm disputes between them and the clergy, on various points. And not only theologians, but very excellent men among the jurists themselves, have fears lest religion should at length be converted into a mere political engine for the security of civil government, if the opinions of some of these men should acquire authority.

§ 16. The immense licentiousness of thinking, and of spreading among the common people even the vilest and most senseless opinions, which began to prevail in the preceding century, has increased and become more confirmed every where among us, in the present century. Hence there have arisen, and still arise at the present time, so many persons, some of them full of fanatical folly, some delirious and beside themselves, and some the fabricators of new religions, who freely divulge all their dreams, and every where produce departures from the established rules of faith and practice, and excite discords and contentions. Besides those already named, the following are notorious: *John Tennhart, John Geo. Gichtel, John William Ueberfeld, John Geo. Rosenbach, Geo. Christoph. Brendel, John Christoph. Seizen, Anthony Ræmeling*, and many others; who either boast of being guided by a divine impulse, or offer to the credulous multitude in different ways and with different success, their fancied modifications and improvements of the church. These men have been opposed by our theologians in numerous publications: but many of them were unworthy of confutation. The greatest part have become convicted of their folly, by

the course of events and by actual results, rather than by arguments and reasoning. For as men of this character start up of a sudden, so for the most part they soon ruin their own cause, either by their indiscretions, or by their corrupt morals and base conduct, or lastly by their disagreement among themselves.

§ 17. Many place in this class the *Herrenhutters*, or those who first associated at *Herrenhut* in Lusatia under the illustrious count *Zinzindorf*, and who afterwards increasing, have spread themselves through a large part of Europe, and even travelled to the Indies, to Tartary, and the utmost bounds of the earth. They tell us they are descendants of those Bohemian and Moravian brethren, who in the fifteenth century were excited by the preaching and example of *John Huss* to cast off the Romish yoke. They might more correctly call themselves *imitators* of those brethren: for it is conceded by all, that only a very small part of this new fraternity consists of Bohemians and Moravians; and it is very uncertain also, whether such of them as are Bohemians by descent, are the posterity of those ancient Bohemian brethren. They declare farther, that they do not differ from the Lutherans in regard to doctrines, but only in their customs and regulations, in which they come near to the ancient Bohemians. But many question, whether they here assert the truth; and are suspicious, that these new brethren adopt the language of the Lutherans while among the Lutherans, the more readily to obtain toleration; and that in reality, they are a mixture of people of various characters and sentiments. However this may be, it is at least difficult to understand, why they are so zealous to extend their particular sect, if they differ from us only in their customs and mode of discipline. For whoever truly follows *Jesus Christ*, will care little how the Christian community is constituted and regulated; because he knows, that religion does not consist in external rites and regulations, but in faith and love.

§ 18. This progress of superstition among us, as many supposed, nothing could arrest except philosophy. And hence the cultivation of philosophy, which was apparently neglected towards the close of the preceding century, was not only revived, but was prosecuted by many with great diligence. The general method of philosophizing which I have called the *Metaphysical*, obtained preference before all others. This philosophy, the superlative genius of *Godfrey William von Leibnitz* elucidated elegantly, and cast into a better shape: but it was the very acute *Christopher Wolf*, who perfected it, digested it into a system; and,—what was entirely a new thing, and never before attempted,—gave it the form of a mathematical science. In this improved state, most of those who search after truth and certainty, were exceedingly captivated with it, and eagerly applied it to the explanation and confirmation of the truths of revealed religion. But this gave great dissatisfaction to many good men, who were anxious for the safety of the truth taught us by Christ: and hence the old conflict between philosophy and theology, piety and reason, was revived; and it was urged on with great vehemence for a series of years. For many are of opinion, that this metaphysical philosophy imbues the minds of young men with sentiments hostile to all religion and all worship, with arrogance also, contempt for divine revelation, excessive confidence in human reason, and other vices; and that it does not throw light and dignity around theology, but rather darkness and ignominy.

§ 19. In proof of the correctness of this opinion respecting the tendency of this philosophy, they appeal especially to the case of *Lawrence Schmid* of Schweinfurt, who is commonly called the *Wertheim translator*, from the place where he resided. This man, who was by no means destitute of abilities and was very well versed in the philosophy in question, projected a new German translation of the Bible, to serve as the foundation or basis of a new body of divinity, drawn up according to the strict rules of demonstration, which he had in contemplation. But the project was disastrous to him. For scarcely had he published a specimen of the work, in a translation of the inspired books of Moses, when he was not only attacked in numerous publications, but was accused before the supreme tribunal of the Germanic empire, as a capital enemy to the Christian religion, and a caviller at divine truth. The chief ground of accusation was, that he had boldly construed certain passages in the books of Moses, which designated or foretold the coming of Messiah, in such a manner as to give them a different signification. He was therefore thrown into prison, and ordered to be tried for his life. But he escaped from prison, and saved himself by flight.

§ 20. The controversies and contentions of this age have been very numerous. First, what is called the *Pietistic* controversy has been carried on in some places more fiercely, and in others more moderately, according to the dispositions of persons and the circumstances of different parts of the country. But the controversy has gradually abated as time rolled on, and at present it seems to be reduced nearly to the single point, whether an irreligious man may have true and certain knowledge of divine things, or, some sort of illumination; which many regard as a contest about words rather than things. Besides this, there have been several other controversies, which also produced excitement in the preceding century, respecting the eternity of the torments of the damned, the final restoration of all things, Christ's [millennial] reign on the earth; and others of like character. With *John Fabricius*, a divine of Helmstadt, and with some others, there has been dispute, respecting the importance of the disagreement between us and the papists: for he and his associates, deemed it not so great as it is commonly supposed to be; so that he believed a person might lawfully go over to the Romish church. Respecting the law of marriage, the grounds of divorce, and concubinage, there have been great disputes between certain theologians and some distinguished jurists. Minor contests, which suddenly spring up and as soon die away, as they contribute little to a knowledge of the internal state of the church, need not be enumerated.

§ 21. The Reformed church not only preserves the same aspect which was above described, but studies to make it still more her appropriate characteristic.(2) For notwithstanding the formulas of faith, by which the vigilance of their ancestors enclosed and fortified their religion, remain every where the same; yet in most countries, no preacher is compelled to think in exact accordance with them, but is supposed to fulfil his duty if he holds up the great and primary truths of Christianity, and avoids too much

(2) [Dr. *Mosheim* still continues to speak of all those who are styled *Reformed*, as if they were united in *one church* or religious community, while in fact, they form a number of totally distinct communities, often differing widely in doctrine, discipline, and worship, and in several instances having no sort of communion with each other. And hence his remarks respecting them as a body, are liable to much criticism.—*Tr.*]

familiarity with the papists and Socinians. Hence in this very ample community, at the present day, Arminians, Supralapsarians, Infralapsarians, and Universalists [i. e., believers in a universal atonement], live amicably together; and with united efforts strive to extenuate and lessen the importance of those contests, that divide the Christians who have separated themselves from the Romish communion. There are indeed some, especially among the Swiss, the Germans, and the Dutch, who are greatly troubled at this moderation, and deplore bitterly the loss of the ancient purity and rigour, and occasionally wax warm and attack the despisers of their ancient discipline. But the others, who are greatly superior in numbers, respectability, and power, care little for their resentments.

§ 22. Whoever therefore duly considers the whole subject, must freely acknowledge, that neither the Lutherans nor the Arminians have any longer ground for controversy with the Reformed *church*, but only with individual doctors of this family. For this *church* leaves every one at liberty to think as he pleases, on those points which were formerly the ground of its separation from the Lutherans and Arminians, and deems the fundamentals of religion safe, however those points are explained. And yet this very moderation thwarts the designs of such as would effect a union between the Lutherans and the Reformed. For those among *us* who are strenuous for orthodoxy, complain that the Reformed open the door of salvation too wide, and that they offer communion and friendship not only to us, but to all the sectarians. When therefore about twenty years ago, [thus wrote *Mosheim* in 1741. The precise year of *Pfaff's* attempts for a union, was 1719.—*Schl.*], when certain excellent men among us, (at the head of whom was *Christopher Matth. Pfaff*, a man on many accounts venerated and renowned), took very great pains to effect a union between us and the Reformed, the majority [of the Lutherans] so vigorously opposed the object, both by action and by publications, that it was soon abandoned.

§ 23. The English church, which holds the first rank among the Reformed, is the same now that it was in the time of *William* III. The *Episcopalians* are the reigning party, and number among their adherents the king himself, with the nobility of the realm, and the greatest part of the people. But toleration is granted to the *Puritans* or *Presbyterians*, and to all the others who are included under the very comprehensive appellation of *Nonconformists*. Those however who are particularly acquainted with English affairs, tell us that the Nonconformists diminish continually, and that this gradual diminution is ascribable to the mildness and gentleness of the bishops towards them. The *Episcopolians* are of two sorts. Some believe the government by bishops to be of divine institution; and they exalt and magnify immoderately the prerogatives of the church. Others are more temperate; and though they fully believe, that an ecclesiastical government by bishops is more holy and more perfect than any other, and think that great care should be taken, to prevent the clergy from becoming subject to the will and authority of kings and magistrates; yet they do not invidiously deny the name of a *church* to those communities in which there are no bishops; and they are temperate in defending the prerogatives of prelates among Christians.(3) These two parties are sometimes en-

(3) ["The learned and pious archbishop *Wake*, in a letter to father *Courrayer*, dated from Croydon House, July 9, 1724, expresseth himself thus: 'I bless God, that I was

gaged in sharp contests; a striking example of which, occured in the present century. For the present bishop of Winchester, *Benjamin Hoadley*, a man eminent for talents and eloquence, greatly lowered down the authority of the church, that is, of its presiding officers, and confined it within narrow limits. On the other hand, *John Potter*, now archbishop of Canterbury and at the head of the British clergy, and others, contended for the prerogatives and authority of the church, with great eloquence and erudition. Moreover the disposition of the established church of England towards those that dissent from it, cannot be learned from any thing, more exactly, than from the fact that *William Wake*, the late archbishop of Canterbury, a few years ago was disposed to form an alliance with the French church, on terms that would secure to both most of their respective peculiarities of sentiment.(4)

§ 24. The unbounded liberty which Englishmen enjoy of publishing their opinions without restraint, and of worshiping God in the manner each one thinks right, naturally causes various sects to arise here and there, and controversies respecting things pertaining to religion to be perpetual. But it is hardly possible for any one, who has not himself lived some time in England, and formed acquaintance on the spot with the opinions, privileges, laws, and parties of that happy nation, to give a full and accurate account of these different sects and controversies. Of several of the sects, not even the names reach us; and of many of them, we have only a species of knowledge which is quite imperfect and indistinct. Of the controversies, we are to a great extent unable to ascertain the true foundation, and the points at issue, because we are destitute of the sources from which information can be drawn. At this present time, one *George Whitefield* is collecting a party, and contemplates the formation of a Christian community, more perfect than all others; nor is he altogether unsuccessful. It would seem, if the man is self-consistent, and does not follow the blind impulse of fancy rather than any determined rule, that he places religion altogether in holy emotions, and an indescribable kind of sensation; and that he requires his followers to dismiss all reliance on reason and study as means of [religious] knowledge, and to resign up their minds to be guided and instructed by a divine illumination.

§ 25. The Dutch, quite down to our times, have been occupied with the Cocceian and Cartesian controversies, though now less intensely than heretofore. And there is a prospect that these contests will wholly cease, since the Newtonian mode of philosophizing has expelled the Cartesian from the Dutch universities. Of the Roëllian disputes, we have already given an account. *Frederick van Leenhof*, in the year 1703, fell under suspicion of being a Spinozist; and was attacked by many, on account of a book he published, entitled *Heaven upon earth* (Cœlum in terris); in which he taught, that a Christian should always be joyful, and never mourn

born and have been bred in an Episcopal church; which I am convinced has been the government established in the Christian church from the very times of the Apostles. But I should be unwilling to affirm, that where the ministry is not episcopal, there is *no church*, nor any *true* administration of the sacraments. And very many there are among us, who are zealous for Episcopacy, and yet dare not go so far as to annul the ordinances of God performed by any other ministry.' "—*Mael.*]

(4) [See the account of this negotiation of archbishop *Wake*, and the letters that passed between him and *Du Pin* on the subject, in *Dr. Maclaine's* third Appendix to his translation of *Mosheim's* Institutes of Eccl. Hist.—*Tr.*]

or be sorrowful. The same crime was charged by many upon *William Deurhoff*, an illiterate man, who published several tracts in the vernacular tongue, in which he speculated concerning the divine nature, as if he viewed it to be an *energy* pervading the whole material universe, and operative in all parts of it. The most recent contests are those of *James Saurin* and *Paul Maty*. The former, a minister of the gospel at the Hague, and distinguished for his genius and eloquence, if he erred at all, erred very slightly. For if we except a few inaccurate and unwary expressions, he deviated from the common doctrine only in this one point, that he thought it sometimes lawful to deceive men by our speech, for the sake of accomplishing some great good.(5) Most of the Reformed churches, it is to be noted, adopt the principle of *Augustine*, that every deception and every falsehood is sinful. The other, namely *Maty*, committed a much greater fault. For in order to explain the profound mystery of three persons in one God, and to render it easy to be understood, he assumed, that the Son and the Holy Spirit are two finite beings, created by God, and who at a certain time became united to God.(6)

§ 26. In Switzerland, especially in the canton of Bern, the *Formula Consenus* which has been already mentioned, produced very fierce disputes. In the year 1718, the magistrates of Bern required all public teachers, and particularly those of the university and church of Lausanne, (in whom there was supposed to be some stain of error), to assent to this *Formula*, and to receive it as the pattern of their faith: for it had for some time been neglected, and subscription to it had not in all cases been required. But several both of the professors and of the candidates for the sacred office, declared that they could not conscientiously subscribe: and accordingly some of them were subjected to punishment. This caused grievous contentions and complaints, to quiet which, the king of Great Britain and the States-General of Holland, as well as others, offered their kind offices. The result was, that the *Formula* lost much of its credit and authority. In the German [Reformed] churches, nothing very noticeable has occurred. The Palatine church, once so very flourishing, has suffered, through the machinations of the papists, a great diminution of its prosperity.

§ 27. The Socinians, dispersed over various countries of Europe, have hitherto been able no where, [except in Transylvania.—*Schl.*], to obtain the liberty of forming themselves into a regular community, and of publicly setting up worship according to the views of their sect. At the head of their learned men in our times, stood *Samuel Crell*, who died at an advanced age at Amsterdam. He however chose to be called an *Artemonite*, rather than a Socinian: and he actually differed on many points, from the common doctrines of the Socinians. The Arians obtained a great advocate in *William Whiston*, a professor [of mathematics] in the university of Cambridge; who chose rather to resign his chair, than to renounce his opinions, which he defended in numerous publications. Similar to him, according to the common estimation, was *Samuel Clarke*, a man richly endowed with powers of genius and education, who in the year 1724, was convicted of adulterating

(5) [" See *Saurin's* Discours Historiques, Theologiques, Critiques, et Moraux, sur les evenemens les plus memorables du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament, tome i. of the folio edition."—*Macl.*]

(6) [See *Dr. Mosheim's* Historia Critica novæ explicationis Dogmatis de tribus in Deo personis, quam vir clariss. Paulus Maty excogitavit: in his Dissertt. ad Historiam Eccles. pertinentes, tom. ii., p. 399–582.—*Tr.*]

the sound doctrine in regard to three persons in the Godhead. But no ingenuous and reasonable man will rank *Dr. Clarke* among the Arians, if this name is to be taken in its native and proper acceptation. For he merely defended, with greater clearness and diligence, what is called the Arminian *subordination*, which has been, and is still, embraced by so many of the first men, and by very learned prelates in England; and taught, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are in *nature* equal, but in *rank* unequal.(7) A great number of persons among the English have endeavoured, in various ways, to invalidate and assail the most sacred doctrine of the divine Trinity. And this induced an opulent lady, whose name was *Moyer*, to leave by her will a rich legacy, as a premium for eight public discourses to be delivered annually by some learned man, in opposition to this species of impiety. The institution has been in operation since the year 1720, and promises to future ages, a rich collection of the best productions in defence of this part of revealed religion.

(7) [" *Dr. Moshiem* has here mistaken the true hypothesis of *Dr. Clarke*, or at least expressed it imperfectly; for what he says here is rather applicable to the opinion of *Dr. Waterland*. *Dr. Clarke* maintained an equality of perfections between the three Persons, but a *subordination of nature* in point of existence and derivation."—*Macl.*]

INDEX

TO THE THIRD VOLUME.

A.

Abbas I., king of Persia, 353.
Abbot, George, archbishop of Canterbury, 409.
Abrahams, Galenus, 472.
Abrams, Nicholas, 318, n. (107).
Abyssinian church, 119.
——— missions, papal, 95, n. (6), 302, &c., 487.
——— missions, Protestant, 352, &c.
Achery, Luke d', 318, n. (110), 321.
Achigian, Andrew, 352.
Adiaphoristic controversy, Lutheran, 63, 145, &c.
———, Reformed, 187, &c.
Adolphus, John, duke of Holstein, 394.
Æpinus, John, 159.
Affelmann, John, 366, n. (17), 289.
Africa, missions to, 259, &c.
Agreement of Sendomir, 183.
Agricola, John, 63, 143, n. (28).
Aguirre, Joseph, 321, n. (114).
Aids of grace, congregations on, 111, 327, &c.: see *Grace*.
Albaspinius, Gabriel, 322, n. (159).
Albius, Thomas, 343, n. (212).
Alcantara, Peter de, 344.
Alciat, Jo. Paul, 227, n. (11).
Alexander VI., pope, 9.
——— VII., pope, 284, n. (3), 308.
——— VIII., pope, 285, n. (6).
Alexandria, patriarchate, 113.
Allatius, Leo, 323, n. (171), 346, n. (4).
Altorf Socinianism, 474.
Altenburg conference, 151.
Amboyna, Dutch missions to, 259, n. (24).
American missions, 73, 75, 260–264.
Ames, William, 194, n. (81), 399.
Amusements, improper, 383.
Amsdorf, Nicholas, 147.
Amyraut, Moses, 294, n. (29), 399, 403, &c.
Anabaptists, 58, &c., 140, 223, 234, 422.
——— or Mennonites, history of, 16th cent., 198, &c.; 17th cent., 469, &c.
Ancestors, worship of, in China, 254, &c., n. (18), 483.
Andradius, Ja. Paya, 98, &c., n. (41).
Andreæ, James, 152, 153, 154.
———, Jo. Valentine, 366, &c., n (17).
Anglus, Thomas, 343, n. (212).
Anhalt princes join the Reformed, 185.
Annates, 83, n. (5).
Antinomians, Lutheran, 143, 144.
———, English, 423.
Antioch, patriarchate, 113, 114.
Antipædobaptists, English, 218.
Antitrinitarians, 477.
Antony, Paul, 379, 382.
Apology for the Augsburg confession, 54.
Apostool, Samuel, 472.
Appeals to councils, origin of, 12.
Appellants, 487. See *Jansenists*.
Arcimbald, Jo. Andrew, 45, n. (57).
Arians, in 16th cent., 223, 229, note, 230, &c., 242; in 17th, 476, n (8), 477, 493, &c.
Aristotelians, in 16th cent., 15, 97, 134, 191, &c.; in 17th, 274, 276, 277, 317, 362, &c., 397.
Armenians, in 16th cent., 85, 120, 126; in 17th, 353, &c.
Arminians, 399, 401, &c., 404, 435–447, 491.
Arminius, James, 401, 436, &c., n. (1), 445, n. (21).
Arnaud, Anthony, 108, 317, 320, n. (124), 334, &c., 349.
———, Jaqueline, 337.
Arndt, John, 135, n. (15), 368, note, 370, 390
Arnold, Godfrey, 384, &c., n. (32).
Articles of Torgau, 44.
——— of Smalcald, 58, n. (10).
——— V., Arminian, 438, 444, &c., n. (21).
Asseburg, Lady Juliana, 386.
Atheists in 18th cent., 484, &c.
Atonement, disputes on, 150, 151, 403, n. (25), 434, 435, n. (91).
Augustinus, Jansenius's book, 329, 332.
Augustus, elector of Saxony, 152, 153.
———, king of Poland, 300, n (53).
Aubespine, Gabriel, 322, n. (159).
Augsburg Confession, 44, 51, &c., n. (2), 132, 286.
———, Diets of, 23, 51, 62, &c. 65, &c.
Antherius, bishop of Bethlehem, 245.
Austrian Protestants, 286.

B.

Bacon, Francis, Lord Verulam, 271, 280.
Bahnsen, Benedict, 392, n. (42).
Baius, Michael, 99, n. (41), 109, n. (59).
Baldwin, Frederic, 367, note, 389.
Baluze, Stephen, 322, n. (163).
Bancroft, Richard, archbishop, 178.
Baptists: see *Anabaptists* and *Mennonites*.
———, English, 217, &c., 423, n. (60), 472, n. (10).
———, General, 217, 218, 472, n. (10).
———, Particular, 217, &c., 472, n. (10).
Barberini, Cardinal, 244, n. (3).
Barefooted monks, Franciscan, 94.
Barnabites, order of, 95.
Baronius, Cæsar, 97, 304, 320, n. (128).
Barre, Nicholas, 315.
Barrow, Isaac, 280.
Bartholomew's eve, massacre, 173, note.

Baschi, Matthew de, 94.
Basilides, John, Czar, 117, 125.
——— ———, emperor of Abyssinia, 302, &c.
Basnage, James, 299, n. (47).
Batavia, church there, 259, n. (24).
Bathori, Transylvanian, family of, 236.
Bayer, Christian, 51.
Bayle, Peter, 281, n. (81).
Baylonius, Paschal, canonized, 345.
Beaugendre, Anthony, 318, n. (113).
Beaulieu, Lewis le Blanc de, 294, n. (29), 297, 406.
Becan, Martin, 287, n. (12), 321, n. (136).
Bechmann, Fridem., 367, note.
Becker, Balth., 280, 432, &c., n. (87).
Bedingfield, colonel, 258, n. (22).
Behm, John and Michael, 376.
Bellarmin, Robert, 104, 320, n. (129).
Bembus, Peter, 76, &c., n. (10).
Benedict XIII., pope, 485.
——— XIV., pope, 485.
Benedictine monks, 311, 318, &c.
Benin, Catholic mission to, 260.
Bennet, Gervas, 448.
Bern, canton, 13, n. (11), 170, 493.
Bernardines of la Trappe, 313.
Bernouilli, James and John, 272.
Bertius, Peter, 300, n. (57)
Berulle, John or Peter de, 314.
Besold, Christian, 301, n. (58).
Beton, cardinal, 174, n. (38).
Beza, Theodore, 167, &c., 171, 192.
Bezpopoftschins, Russian sect, 350, n. (12).
Bibliander, Theodore, 197.
Biblical colleges at Halle, 433, &c., note.
Bibliotheca Fratr Polonor., 236, n. (34).
Biddle, John, 476, n. (8), 477, n. (10).
Bishops, Catholic, 12, 46, &c., 93, 178, 310.
———, English, 66, &c., n. (8)–(10), 176, &c., 179, &c., 189, 190, n. (70), 408, &c., 411, 417, 424, 425, &c.
———, Scotish, 417, n. (58), 425.
Blacklo, Thomas, 343, n. (212).
Blanc, Lewis le: see *Beaulieu*.
Blandrata, George, 235, &c.
Blesdyck, Nicholas, 219, n. (36).
Blondell, David, 404.
Bloody statute of Henry VIII., 60, n. (14).
Blount, Charles, 267, n. (44).
Blum, Henry Julius, 300, n. (52), 301.
Bockholt or Bockold, John, 58, 205.
Bodin, John, 76, n (10).
Body of Christ, origin of, 214, n. (24); ubiquity of, see *Ubiquity*.
Boesius, John George, 387.
Boetius, Henry, 389.
Böhmen, Jacob, 275, 391, n. (41).
Bohemia, reformation in, 49, n. (63), 183, &c.
Bohemian Brethren, 183, &c.
——— ——— war, 286, &c.
Bogermann, John, 442, n (14), (15).
Boisneburg, John Christian von, 300, n. (54).
Bolland John, a Jesuit, 321, n. (153).
Bolsec, Jerome, 196.
Bona, John, cardinal, 322, n. (164).
Bonfrere, James, a Jesuit, 321, n. (149).
Borromeo, Charles, canonized, 344.
Bossuet, James Benignus, 293, n (28), 295, n. (35), 299, n. (47), 309, n. (82), 322, n. (166), 342
***Boulainvilliers*, count, 270, n. (55).**
Bourbon, Anne Genevieve de, 334.
Bourignon de la Porte, Antoinette, 480.
Bourne, Rev. Richard, 263.
Bouwenson, Leonard, Mennonite, 209.
Boyle, Robert, 258, n. (22), 265, 272, 280.
Boylean Lectures, 265, n. (35).
Brahmins, 247, n. (9).
Brahe, Tycho, 272.
Brandenburg embraced Reformed doctrines, 356, &c.; received Socinians, 476, n. (8).
Breckling, Frederic, 392.
Bredenburg: see *Breitenburg*.
Breitenburg, John and Paul, 479, n. (2).
Bremen joins the Reformed, 171.
Brendel, George Christopher, 488.
Brentius, John, 36, note, 159.
Britain, Reformation in, 49, n. (64), 59, &c., 66, &c. See *England*, *Scotland*.
Bromley, Thomas, 481, n. (8).
Brown, George, archbishop of Dublin, 69.
———, Robert, 181, &c., 415.
Brownists, 181, &c., 412, n. (52), &c.
Brunus, Jordan, 76, n. (10).
Bucer, Martin, 163, 167.
Budneians, a Socinian sect, 230, 240.
Budneius, Simon, a Socinian, 240, &c
Bugenhagius, John, 46, 137.
Bull against Jansenius, 333.
—— against Luther, 29, 30.
—— Unigenitus, 485, 486.
Bullinger, Henry, 192.
Burgo, Aug. Gibbon von, 294.
Burgundy, James of, 196.
Burrhi or Borrhus, Jos. Fran., 343, &c.
Buscher, Statius, 372.

C.

Cajetan, Thomas, cardinal, 23, &c., 103.
Calixtus, George, 297, 361, 367, note, 370, 371, &c., n. (21), 375, n. (22).
———, Frederic Ulric, 367, note, 375.
Calixtine controversies, 371–377.
Calovius, Abraham, 367, note, 369, 372, 374, note.
Calvin, John, 160, 163, 164, 167, 168, n. (24), 169, 170, 171, 191, 192, 193, 194, &c., 224, &c., n. (8).
Camerarius, Joachim, 134, 137.
Camero, John, 403.
Campanella, Thomas, 79.
Campanus, John, 223, n. (5).
Campegius, Laurentius, 34.
Canons, regular, 93; some orders abolished, 311, n. (87).
Canonizations, in the 17th cent., 344.
Canus, Melchior, 98, note.
Canute, John, Danish bishop, 394.
Capnio or Reuchlin, John, 13, n. (10).
Cappel, Lewis, 405.
Capuchins, monks, 94, 260.
Caranza, Bartholomew, 98, note.
Cardanus, Jerome, 79.
Cardinals, 81, 82.
Carlo, John, 133.
Carmelites, monks, 94, &c.
Carnatic, mission to, 247, n (9).
Carolostadt, Andrew, 24, 25, 32, &c., 140.
Carpzov, John Benedict, 367, note.
Des Cartes, René, 271, 276, 277, 317, 363, 428, 429.
Cartesian philosophy, 269, 277, &c.

Cassander, George, 99, n. (41).
Castalio, Sebastian, 195, &c., n. (89).
Casuists, Romish, 324.
Catechism, Luther's, 129.
———, the Heidelberg, 171.
Catharinus, Ambrose, 98, note.
Cathedrals, English, disliked, 178.
Catholic church, state of, before Luther, 8, &c.
——— in 16th cent., 80, &c.; in 17th, 282, &c.
Cattenburg, Andrew van, 444, n. (20).
Caussinus, Nicholas, 321, n. (138).
Celibacy of the clergy, 12, 93, 101, n. (46), 296, note.
Cellot, Lewis, 321, n. (137).
Cene, Charles le, 407, &c.
Centuriæ Magdeburgicæ, 97, n. (40).
Ceremonies and rites, popish, 16, 112; English Episcopal, 66, n. (8), 68, n. (10), 176–179, n. (44), 180, 408, n. (42), (43), 410, &c., n. (50), 424, 425.
Ceylon, Dutch missions to, 259, n. (25).
Chaldaic Christians: see *Nestorians*.
Cham-Hi, emperor of China, 251.
Chamsi or Solares, oriental sect, 124.
Charenton, decrees of, 358, &c., n. (4).
Charitable conference in Poland, 293.
Charles V., emperor, 30, 40, &c., 42, 43, 57, 59, 62, &c., 64, &c.
——— I. of England, 292, 410–412, 414, note, 418, note.
——— II. of England, 292, 419, note, 425.
Charron, Peter, 76, &c., n. (10).
Chemnitz, Martin, 97, 133, 137, 154.
Cherbury, Edward Herbert of, 267, n. (43).
Chillingworth, William, bishop, 424.
China, missions to, 75, 250–255, 483.
Christian II., king of Denmark, 45.
——— III., king of Denmark, 46.
——— VI., king of Denmark, 484.
——— William, of Brandenburg, 300, n. (50).
Christina, queen of Sweden, 289, 299, &c., n. (48).
Chubb, John, deist, 484.
Church government, Armenian, 120.
———, Calvinistic Baptist, 217.
———, Dutch Reformed, 186.
———, English Episcopal, 176, 178, 179, 180, 187–189, 426, 427.
———, French Protestant, 172, n. (37).
———, Georgian, 118.
———, Greek, 113, &c.
———, Independent, 181, &c.
———, Lutheran, 130, &c., 366, 488.
———, Mennonite, 470, &c.
———, Monophysite or Jacobite, 118, &c.
———, Nestorian, 121, &c.
———, Presbyterian, 168, &c., 186, 187, &c., 189, &c., n. (68), 419, note, 420, note.
———, Quaker, 459, &c., 465, &c.
———, Romish, 8, &c., 12, 80, &c., 92, 93, 100, 105, &c., 304, &c.
———, Russian, 117, &c., 351.
———, Schwenckfeldian, 143, n. (27).
———, Scotch, 176, n. (38), 418, &c., note.
——— Swiss, 167, &c., 185, &c., 189, &c.
Chytræus, David, 133, 154.
Clarius, Isidorus, 103.
Clarke, Samuel, 494, n. (7).
Claude, John, 293, n. (28), 349
Claudius, an Arian, 223, n. (6).
Clausenburg, seat of Socinians, 241, n. (45).
Clerc, John le, 444, n. (20).
Clement VII., pope, 34, 41, 57, 59, 91, n. (21).
——— VIII., pope, 92, 282, 327.
——— IX., pope, 284.
——— X., pope, 284.
——— XI., pope, 285, n. (8), 485.
——— XII., pope, 485.
Clergy, popish, 13, &c., 86, &c., 93, &c., 310, &c.
———, Lutheran, 17th cent., 364, &c., 377, n. (27).
Clerks, regular, new orders, 95.
———, Theatins, 95.
——— of St. Paul or Barnabites, 95.
——— of St. Majoli or of Somasquo, 95.
Cocceius, John, 398, 428, 429, &c.
Cochin China, missions to, 248.
Cochlæus, John, 98, n. (41).
Codde, Peter, 335.
Cointe, Charles le, 319, n. (118).
Colchians, state of, 118.
Collegia pietatis, 377, &c., n. (27), 379, &c
Collegiants, sect, 476, 478, &c.
College de Propaganda, 243, &c.
Collins, Anthony, 484.
Combe, Francis de la, 341, n. (207).
Combefis, Francis, 320, n. (134).
Conclave, Romish, 81, n. (1).
Concordate, French, 11.
Conferences, Hampton court, 408, n. (43).
——— with papists, at Ratisbon, Newburg, Rheinfels, and Thorn, 293, n. (28).
———, Lutheran and Reformed, at Leipsic, Cassel, and Thorn, 359, n. (5), 373, note.
Confessions of faith, Arminian, 436, n. (1), 446, &c.
———, the Augsburg: see *Augsburg*.
———, Belgic, 182, n. (48).
———, English, xxxix. articles, 67, n. (8), 68, n. (10), 420, note.
———, General Baptist, 218, n. (32).
——— of Greek church, 115.
——— of Independents, Savoy, 413, note.
——— of Lutheran church, 129.
———, Mennonite, 210, n. (19), 211, n. (20).
———, Particular Baptist, 217, n. (31), 472, n. (10).
———, Presbyterian, Westminster, 421, n.
———, Quaker, 458, n. (21), 461, &c.
———, Tetrapolitan, 53, note.
——— of Zwingle, 54, n. (2).
Conformists, English, 176, &c.
Confucius, worship of, 254, &c., n. (18), 483, &c.
Congregationalists, 412, &c., n. (53), (54). See *Independents*.
Congregations, at Rome, 82, n. (2).
——— de Propaganda, 243, &c.
——— of priests for foreign missions, at Paris, 244, &c., 249.
——— of the holy sepulchre, 245.
——— on the council of Trent, 99, n. (42).
——— de Auxiliis gratiæ, 111, n. (65), '66), 327, &c.
Connecticut Indians, 264, n. (32).
Consensus repetitus, Lutheran, 374.
——— of Sendomir, 183.

Constantinople, patriarchate of, 113, &c., 347, n. (5).
Constantius, a Greek in Siam, 249, &c., n. (12).
Consubstantiation, doctrine of, 169, n. (25), 187; divides the Reformers, 43, 53, &c., note: see *Sacramentarian* controversy.
Contra-Remonstrants, 436.
Controversies in the Romish church, 16th cent., 105, &c.; 17th, 327, &c.; 18th, 485, &c.
———— in Lutheran church, 16th cent., 139, &c.; 17th, 371, &c.; 18th, 490.
———— in Reformed churches, 16th cent., 162, &c., 176, &c., 194, &c.; 17th, 400, &c., 425, &c.; 18th, 492, &c.
Conventual brethren, 311, n. (87).
Convocation, English, 189.
Cooper, Anthony Ashly, 266, &c., n. (41).
Coornhart, Theodore Volckh., 400, n. (16).
Copts, state of, 119; missions to, 85, 352.
Cordt, Christian Bartholomew de, 481.
Corporation Act, 425, n. (70).
Corvinus, John, 388.
Cotelier, John Baptist, 323, n. (173).
Cotton, John, 264, n. (32).
Councils, general, power of, 12.
———, general, demanded, 34, 40, 57, 60, &c.
——— of Orleans and Tours, 10, n. (5).
——— of Pisa and Milan, 10, n. (5).
———, the Lateran, 10, n. (5), 485.
Covenants of God, theory of, 430.
Court, Romish, 81, &c., n. (1)–(3), 485.
——— of high Commission, 178, &c., n. (43).
Cranmer, Thomas, archbishop, 59, 60, 67.
Crautwald, Valentine, 141, n. (24).
Crell, Nicholas, 157.
——, Samuel, 477, n. (9), 493.
Cromwell, Oliver, 292, 416, &c., 419, note, 422, n. (58), 450, &c.
Cruciger, Casper, 159.
Crypto-Calvinists, 151–158, 165.
Cudworth, Ralph, 278, 400.
Cuiper, Francis, 479, n. (2).
Cumberland, Richard, 400.
Curcellæus, Stephen, 444, n. (20).
Curtius, Sebastian, 359.
St. Cyran, abbot of: see *Hauranne*.
Cyrillus Lucaris of Constantinople, 347, n. (5).
——— Contari of Berrhœa, 348, n. (5), (6).
Czechovius, Martin, 242.

D.

D'Achery, Luke, 318, n. (110), 321.
Daillé, John, 404.
Danes incline to the Reformed, 185, 394.
Danhauer, John Conrad, 366, 368, note, 389.
Daniel, Gabriel, 324, note.
Danish East India missions, 484.
Dantzigers, Mennonites, 470.
Darnly, Lord Henry, 176, n. (38).
Daughters of Charity, 315.
David or Davides, Francis, 236, n. (30), 241.
David George or Jorris, 219, n. (36).
Deists, in 16th cent., 76, &c., n. (10); in 17th, 265, &c., 423; in 18th, 484, &c.
Denk, John or Hans, 203, n. (7).
Denmark, reformation in, 45, &c.
Deurhof, William, 493.
Devay, Matthew, 184.
Dezius, John, Jesuit, 295.
Dieu, John de, canonized, 345.
Dippel, John Conrad, 385.
Discalceati: see *Barefooted*.
Disputations, public, 293.
Dissenters, English: see *Puritans*, *Nonconformists*, *Independents*, &c.
Diversions, lawfulness of, 383.
Dodwell, Henry, 426, n. (76).
Dogmatics: see *Theology*, dogmatic.
Dolet, Stephen, 76, &c., n. (10).
Dominicans, 13, 28, 111, &c., 327, &c., 338, &c., 486.
Dorschæus, John George, 366, &c., n. (17).
Dort, synod of, 401, &c., 440–443.
Dositheus, bishop of Jerusalem, 348, &c.
Drabiz, Nicholas, 391.
Dreyer, Christian, 376.
Druses, sect of, 124, n. (35).
Dudith, Andrew, 231, n. (20).
Durœus or Dury, John, 360, &c., n. (8).
Dutch, reformation of, 49, &c., n. (66), 70, &c., n. (14).
Dutch church, 16th cent., 182; 17th, 427, &c., 429, &c.

E.

Easter sermons and laughter, 16, n. (14).
Ecclesiastical history cultivated, 96, 97, 133, 272.
Echellensis, Abraham, 346, n. (4).
Eckius, John, 22, 24, 28, 60, 98, n. (41).
Eclectic philosophers, 281, 364.
Edict of Nantes, 174, n. (37), 396, n. (5).
Edward VI. of England, 66, n. (8).
Election, disputes on, 158, 164, &c.: see *Grace* and *Predestination*.
Eliot, John, 262, n. (32).
Elias II. and III., Nestorian patriarchs of Mosul, 354.
Elizabeth, queen of England, 67, &c., 177, 188, n. (66).
————, abbess of Hervorden, 479.
Emser, Jerome, 98, n. (41).
England, reformation in, 49, n. (64), 59, &c., 66–68.
————, church of, 16th cent., 66–68, 175, &c.; 17th, 291, &c., 398, &c., 401, &c., 408–412, 420, 421, 422, note, 424, 425, &c., 491, &c.
Episcopius, Simon, 440, 441, 444, n. (20), 445.
Erasmus, Desiderius, 103.
Ernest, Justinian, 258, n. (21).
————, landgrave of Hesse, 293, 300, n. (51).
————, duke of S. Gotha, 352, &c., 374, note.
Espencæus, Claudius, 98, note, 103.
Essential truths of Christianity, 361, 376, 389, 424, 445, &c., 472, 478, 490, &c.
Estius, William, 322, n. (157).
Excommunication, Mennonite, 215.

F.

Faber, John, bishop of Vienna, 53, 98, note.
————, Tanaquil, 297.
Fabricius, John, 490.
————, John Lewis, 476.
Fagius, Paul, 66, n. (8).
Family of Love, 220.
Familists, 220, &c., n. (39).
Farell, William, 47, n. (60), 171.
Farnovians, Arians, 230, 242.
Farnovius, Stanislaus, 242.
Fathers of the Oratory, 96, n (39), 314, n. (94), 319, 327.
———— of the Christian doctrine, 95.

Fathers of Somasquo, 95.
Felgenhauer, Paul, 391.
Fenelon, Francis Salignac de, 322, n. (167), 342.
Ferdinand I. and II., emperors, 56, 288.
Feuardent, Francis, 320, n. (131).
Fevre, James le, 47, n. (60).
Fifth monarchy men, 417, &c.
Filesac, John, 323, n. (174).
Fire philosophy, 79, 135, 274–276, 363, 391.
Fisher, Samuel, a Quaker, 451.
Five points, Arminian, 438, 444, &c., n. (21).
Flacius, Matthias, 97, 133, 137, 146, 147, 148.
Flandrians, 210, 469, 470.
Flemings, 210, 216, 470.
Fludd, Robert, 135, 275, 276, 391.
Forbes, William, 297, n. (40).
Forer, Lawrence, jurist, 286.
Formosa, Dutch missions to, 259, n. (24).
Formula of Concord, 153–158, 165.
——— Consensus, 434, &c., n. (90), 493.
Fossembrun, Lewis de, 94, n. (31).
Fox, George, 221, n. (39), 448, &c., n. (3), 452, n. (8).
France, reformation in, 47, &c., n. (60), 171, &c., 291, 297, &c., 395, 396, 402, &c.
Francis I., king of France, 11, 47, n. (60), 48.
——— de Paris, 337, 487.
Franciscans, 94, 338, &c., 486.
Francke, Aug. Herman, 378, 380, n. (28), 382.
Francken, Christian, 241, n. (45).
Franckenberg, Abraham von, 391.
Frederic the Wise, elector of Saxony, 23, 30, 39.
———, king of Denmark, 45, &c.
——— III., king of Denmark, 475.
——— IV., king of Denmark, 484.
——— III., elector Palatine, 170.
——— V., elector Palatine and king of Bohemia, 286, &c.
——— Augustus, of Saxony, and king of Poland, 300, n. (53).
——— William, of Brandenburg, 360, 372.
———, John, duke of Brunswick, 300, n. (52).
Frederickstadt, Arminian colony, 443.
French nation resist the popes, 10, n. (5), 306, &c., 308, &c., n. (81).
Frequent communion, 108.
Friends: see *Quakers*.
Friesianders, sect, 210, &c., 469.
Frölich, Eva Maria, 391.
Fromm, Andrew, 301, n. (66).

G.

Gagnæus, John, 103.
Gale, Theophilus, 278.
Galenists, sect, 472, 476.
Galanus, Clement, 346, n. (4).
Galileo Galilei, 271, 317.
St. Gali, a Protestant city, 42, n. (51).
Gallic church, liberties of, 10, n. (5), 306, &c., n. '78), 309, n. (81).
Gallon, Anthony, 321, n. (146).
Garissol, Anthony, 405, n. (31).
Garnet, Henry, Jesuit, 291.
Garnier, Julian, 318, n. (114).
Gassendi, Peter, 271, 276, 278, 317, 363, 397.
Gaudanus, Cornelius Aurelius, 13, n. (9).
Gebhard, archbishop of Cologne, 131, n. (4).
Geneva, 167, &c., 400, 402, 435, 447.
Gentilis, Valentine, 227, n. (9).
George or Joris, David, 219, n. (36).
——— of Brandenburg, 42, n. (51).
Georgians, 118, 126.
Gerhard, John, 366, n. (17), 370.
———, John Ernest, 366, n. (17).
Geyer, Martin, 366, &c., n. (17), 369.
Gichtel, John George, 391, 488.
Giftheil, John Lewis, 391.
Glassius, Solomon, 366, &c., n. (17), 369, 374, note, 377.
Godeau, Anthony, 322, n. (168).
Gomarus, Francis, 401, 436.
Gonesius, Peter, 227, n. (12), 242.
Good works, dispute on, 146, &c.
Gospel, Society for the propagation of, 258, &c., n. (22), 263, 264.
Goulart, Simon, 443.
Grace, disputes about, in 16th cent., 25, n. (26), 106, 109–112, 143, 147, 185–187; in 17th, 327–330, 332, &c., 344, n. (215), 387, 388, &c., 400–404, 406, &c., 423, 435, n. (91), 438, &c., 456, n. (19), (20).
Gras, Louisa le, 315.
Gravamina Germanica, 34, n. (41).
Grawer, Albert, 366, &c., n. (17).
Grebel, Conrad, fanatic, 202, &c., n. (7).
Greek church, history of, in 16th cent., 113, &c.; in 17th, 345, &c.; in 18th, 487.
Greeks, state of, 116, &c.; opposed to the Romish church, 346, n. (2), 347.
Gregory XIII., pope, 92, n. (28).
——— XIV., pope, 92.
——— XV., pope, 283.
——— the Abyssinian, 353, n. (20).
Gretzer, James, 320, n. (133).
Grevinchovius, Nicholas, 443.
Grevius, John, 443.
Greulich, Joachim, 391.
Gribaldus, Matthew, 227, n. (11).
Gröningenists, Mennonites, 470, n. (3).
Gross Mennonites, 470, 471, &c.
Grotius, Hugo, 273, 297, 398, 437, 439.
Gruet, James, 195.
Guise, family of, 171, &c., n. (37).
Gustavus Vasa, 44.
——— Adolphus, 288, &c.
Guyon, Madam Jane Maria Bouvieres, 341, &c., n. (208).

H.

Haberkorn, Peter, 293.
Hackspan, Theodore, 366, &c., n. (17).
Hadrian VI., pope, 33, n. (40).
Hager, Balthazar, 286.
Hales, John, 424, 441, n. (12).
Halle, university, 364, 380, n. (28).
Hamel, a Jesuit, 110.
Hamilton, Patrick, 49, n. (64).
Hampton Court Conference, 408, n. (43).
Hanau, church of, 185.
Hardenberg, Albert, 171.
Harduin, John, 317, n. (102), 318, n. (108), 321.
Hattem, Pontianus van, 434.
Hattemists, 433, &c.
Hauranne, John de Verger de, abbot of St. Cyran, 330, n. (188), 335, n. (198).
Hederick, Thomas, 286.
Heidegger, John Henry, 434.
Heidelberg catechism, 171.
Heilbron, a Protestant city, 42, n. (51).
Heilbronn, James, 293.

Heinius, John, 359.
Helladius, Alexander, 345, n. (1).
Hellwig, Christian, 301, n. (67).
Helmont, John Baptist, 275.
Helmstadian controversy, 371, &c.
Hemming, Nicholas, 185, 394.
Henichius, John, 359, 376.
Henry VIII., king of England, 49, n. (61), 59, 60, 66.
—— III., king of France, 171, 173, note.
—— IV., king of France, 172, 174, n. (37), 305.
Henschenius, Godfrey, 321, n. (154).
Herbert, Edward of Cherbury, 267, n. (43).
Herrenhutters, 489.
Heschusius, Tilemann, 156.
Hesse-Cassel adopts Reformed doctrines, 355, &c., n. (1).
Hetzer, Lewis, 202, n. (7), 223.
Hevelius, John, 272.
Heyling, Peter, 352, n. (19).
Hiacoomes, Indian preacher, 263, note.
High church, English, 424, 425–427, n. (75), 491, 492.
Hildebrand, Joachim, 366, n. (17).
Hoadley, Benjamin, 492.
Hobbes, Thomas, 265, &c., n. (36), 400.
Hoburg, Christian, 392.
Hody, Humphrey, 427, n. (76).
Hoe, Matthias, 286, 287, n. (12), 359, 366, n. (17).
Holstenius, Lucas, 301, n. (62), 322, n. (162), 346, n. (4).
Holy Synod of Russia, 351, n. (14).
Hoffmann, rector at Leipsic, 25, 136.
————, Daniel, 363.
————, Melchior, 202, n. (7).
Hoogerbeets, Rombout, 437, 439.
Hoogstrat, James, 22.
Höpfner, Henry, 359.
Horie, Russian heresiarch, 350, n. (12).
Horneius, Conrad, 372.
Hosius, Stanislaus, 98, note.
Hospinian, Rudolph, 197.
Huber, Samuel, 158, n. (57).
————, Ulrich, 431.
Hubmeyer, Balthazar, 202, n. (7).
Huet, Peter Daniel, 281, n. (80), 322, n. (165).
Huguenots, 171: see *France*, reformation in.
Hülsemann, John, 366, n. (17), 372.
Hungary, reformation in, 48, n. (62), 184, 290.
Hunnius, Ægidius, 366, n. (17).
————, Nicholas, 366, n. (17).
————, Helfredius Ulric, 301, n. (59).
Huss, John, 489.
Hussites, 49, n. (63).
Hutter, Leonard, 366, n. (17).
Hypothetical Universalists, 404.

I, J.

Jacobites, 118, n. (14): see *Monophysites*.
James I., king of England, 176, n. (38), 291, 358, 408, &c., 417, n. (58).
—— II., king of England, 292, 419, note, 426.
Jansenius, Cornelius, 329, &c., n. (185), 332.
Jansenists, 313, 319, 326, 330, 332–338, 486, 487.
Japan missions, 75, 255–257.
Jasidians, an Oriental sect, 122, &c.
Java, Dutch missions to, 259, n. (24).
Javorski, Stephen, 351, n. (14), 487.
Jerusalem, patriarchate of, 113, 114; council of, 348, &c.
Jesuits, 74, 87–90, 104, 105, 245–256, 260, 295, 302, 304, &c., n. (74), 307, n. (78), 315, &c., 318, 319, 323–325, 327, &c., 330, 333 482, 483.
Jetzer, John, story of, 13, &c., n. (11).
Ignatius, name of the Jacobite patriarchs, 352, n. (17).
Ignorance, holy, 108.
Ijejas, emperor of Japan, 257, note.
Immaculate conception of Mary, 13, n. (11), 338, &c., n. (202).
Impanation, what, 169, n. (25).
Imputation, doctrine of, 405, n. (31), 435, n. (91).
Independents, English, 181, &c., 400, 411–417, n. (52), &c.
————, American, 262, 416, notes.
Index, expurgatory, 87.
India, missions to, 74, &c., 247–257; India of the west, America, 260–264.
Indifferent things, what to be so accounted, 383: see *Adiaphoristic*.
Indulgences, 11, &c., 16, n. (15), 20, &c.
Infallibility of popes, 106, 333.
Infralapsarians, 400, 401, 402, n. (22), 491.
Innocent IX., pope, 92.
——— X., pope, 283, n. (2), 290, n. (18).
——— XI., pope, 284, n. (5), 308, &c.
——— XII., pope, 285, n. (7).
——— XIII., pope, 485.
Inquisition, 70, 72, 74, 87.
Intention, rightly directed, 107, n. (54), 324.
Interim of Augsburg, 63, n. (3), 146, n. (32).
——— of Leipsic, 145, n. (30).
Johannes or Jansen, Erasmus, 237, 242, n. (47).
Johannite Christians, 122, n. (32).
John, elector of Saxony, 39, 42, n. (51), 57.
—— Adolphus, duke of Holstein, 394.
—— of Braganza, king of Portugal, 306.
—— Christian, of Boisneburg, 300, n. (54).
—— Frederic, of Saxony, 57, 62.
—— Frederic, of Brunswick, 300, n. (52).
—— George, of Saxony, 286, 287, n. (12).
—— George IV., of Saxony, 378, note.
—— Sigismund, of Brandenburg, 356, &c.
—— de S. Cruce, 94.
—— of Leon, canonized, 345.
Jonas, Justin, 137.
Joris or George, David, 219, n. (36).
Irenæus, Christopher, 149.
Ireland, reformation in, 69, n. (12).
Isbraniki, Russian sect, 349.
Isenburg, church of, 185.
Isidorus Clarius, 103.
Isny, city, protested, 42, n. (51).
Italy, reformation in, 71, 72.
Jidiana, Lady Rosamond, 386.
Julius II., pope, 9.
—— III., pope, 71, &c., 91, n. (23).
—— Henry, duke of Brunswick, 136, 156.
Junius, Robert, 259, n. (24).
Jurieu, Peter, 407.
Justification, dispute on, 150, &c.
Justinian, Benedict, 103.

K.

Keith, George, 451, 453, n. (16).
Kempten, city, protested, 42, n. (51).
Kepler, John, 272.
Knorr, Christian, 275, n. (64).
Knox, John, 68, 173, 175, n. (38).

Knutzen, Matthew, 268.
Kober, Tobias, 391.
Koddeus or van der Kodde, John James, Hadrian, and Gisbert, 478.
Kortholt, Christian, 367, n. (17).
Kotter, Christopher, 391.
Kuhlmann, Quirin, 275, 391.
Kunrath, Henry, 135.

L.

Labadie, John, 479, 480, n. (4)
Labadists, sect, 480, n. (4).
Labat, John Baptist, 261, n. (29).
Labbé, Philip, 318, n. (106), 321.
Laderchius, James, 96.
Lainez, Jesuit general, 90, n. (20).
Lambecius, Peter, 301, n. (63).
Lami, Bernhard, 317, 321, n. (152).
Lancelot, Claude, 320, n. (127).
Lapide, Cornelius à, 321, n. (148).
Lasco, John à, 182, &c., n. (51).
Latermann, John, 374, note, 376.
Latitudinarians, English, 424.
Lavater, Lewis, 197.
Laud, William, 292, 410, &c., n. (50), 418, note.
Launoy, John, 306, 322, n. (158).
Leade, Jane, 481, n. (7).
Leenhof, Frederic van, 492.
Leibnitz, Godfrey William von, 272, 280, n. (76), 364, 489.
Leipsic dispute, 24, &c.
——— Conference, 359, n. (5).
Lemmermann, Abraham, 479.
Leo X., pope, 11, 20, 23, 28, 33, 76, 77, note.
— XI., pope, 283.
Lesly, Norman, 174, n. (38).
Less, Leonard, 110.
Leszynsky, Casimir, 268, n. (47).
Lewis XII., king of France, 9.
—— XIII., king of France, 395.
—— XIV., king of France, 303, 307, &c., 317, 340, n. (204), 396, 486.
Libertines, Spiritual, 194, &c.
——— of Geneva, 194, 195.
Lignon, Peter du, 480, n. (4).
Limborch, Philip, 444, n. (20).
Lindau, city, protested, 42, n. (51).
Literature and learning, in the 16th cent., 9, 14, 15, 88, &c., 133, &c., 191, &c., 215, 240; in 17th, 271, &c., 316, &c., 362, &c., 397, &c.
Locke, John, 280.
Louvigni, Berniere de, 341, n. (207).
Low church, English, 426, n. (75), 427, 491, note, 492.
Loyola, Ignatius, canonized, 87, &c., n. (15), 344.
Lubieniezky, Stanislaus, 475.
Lubin, Eilh., 366, n. (17).
Lucaris, Cyrillus, 347, n. (5).
Lucas, a Spinozist, 270, n. (54).
Ludolf, Job, 352, 353.
Luneburg princes, protested, 42, n. (51).
Luther, Martin, 19, &c., n. (16), 20, &c., 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, n. (30), 28–33, 39, &c., 43, 44, 52, 56, n. (6), 57, &c., 61, 138, &c.
Lutheran church, 30, 39, 40, 41; in 16th cent., 128, &c.; in 17th, 355, &c.; in 18th, 487, &c.
Lütkemann, Joachim, 389.
Lyser, Polycarp, 359, 366, n. (17).
——, William, 366, n. (17).

M.

Mabillon, John, 318, n. (109), 321.
Maccovius, John, 193, n. (78).
Madura, missions to, 247, &c.
Magnus, Valerianus, 293.
Maigrot, Charles, 253.
Maimbourg, Lewis, 321, n. (142).
Majoli, St., clerks of, 95.
Major, George, 146, 147.
Malabar, Dutch and Danish missions to, 259, 484.
Malavalle, Francis, 341, n. (207).
Maldonat, John, 98, note, 103.
Malebranche, Francis Nicholas, 280, n. (76), 317.
Mandeville, John, 484.
Manichæism, 201, note, 214, &c., n. (24).
Manz, Felix, 202, n. (7).
Marca, Peter de, 306, 322, n. (160).
Marcellus II., pope, 91.
———, Henry, 295.
Maresius or des Marets, Samuel, 404, 427, 428.
Margaret, queen of Navarre, 47, n. (60), 48, n. (60), 194.
Maria Angelica de St. Magdalena, 337.
Maronites, sect, 127, n. (50), 128.
Marpurg conference, 37, n. (45), 43.
Martene, Edmund, 319, n. (116).
Martha's Vineyard, missions to, 263, note.
Martyr, Peter, 67, n. (8), 192.
Mary, queen of England, 66, 67, n. (9).
——, queen dowager of Scotland, 174, n. (38).
——, queen of Scots, 175, &c., n. (38).
Mashpee Indians, 264, n. (32).
Massachusetts Indians, 262, &c., n. (32).
Massenius, James, 294.
Massuet, Renatus, 318, n. (111).
Mastricht, Peter van, 428, n. (79).
Matamba, missions to, 260.
Mathematical philosophy, 278, &c., 280, 398.
Mathesius, John, 159.
Matthæi, John, 205.
Matthia, John de, 94.
Matthiæ, John, bishop, 361, n. (9).
Maty, Paul, 493.
Maulbron convention and formula, 154, n. (48).
St. Maur, congregation of, 311, &c., n. (88), 318.
Maurice, elector of Saxony, 62–65, n. (6).
———, landgrave of Hesse, 355, 356.
———, prince of Orange, 401, 437, 439, n. (7), 443.
Maximilian I., emperor, 23, 30.
Mayer, Michael, 275, n. (62).
——, John Frederic, 379, note.
Mayhew, Thomas, senior and junior, 263, note.
———, Experience, 263, note.
Medici, dukes of Tuscany, 271, 272.
Meier, Lewis, 270, n. (53).
Meisner, Balthazar, 366, n. (17).
———, John, 366, n. (17).
Melancthon, Philip, 25, &c., n. (29), 52, 54, 60, 63, 79, 132, 133, 134, 137, 138, 139, 144, &c., 147, 163, 164.
Memmingen, city, protested, 42, n. (51).
Menard, Hugh, 321, n. (150).
Mendicant orders, 13, 87.
Menezes, archbishop of Goa, 86.
Mendez, Alphonso, 303, n. (70), 352, n. (19).
Menno, Simonis, 206, n. (15), 207, &c., 470.

Mennonites, 140; history of, in 16th cent., 198, &c.; whether Anabaptists. 198, n. (1); origin, 200, n. (4), 206, 208, n. (16); doctrines, 207, &c., 212, &c.; Gross and Fine, 210; disputes, 214, &c.; in 17th cent., 469, &c.
Mentzer, Balthazar, 366, n. (17), 388.
Mercurius, Francis, 275.
Metaphysical philosophy, 278, 279, n. (75), 280, 364, 489, &c.
Meth, Ezekiel, 392.
Methodists, Romish, 297, &c.
————, English, 492.
Meyer, Gebhard Theodore, 367, n. (17).
Mezzabarba, cardinal, 483.
Millennial reign of Christ, 386, n. (34), 392, 490.
Milletiere, Theophilus Brachet de, 294, n. (29), 297.
Militz, Charles von, 24.
Mingrelians, 117, 126.
Miracles, popish, 14, n. (11), 331, n. (190), 487.
Mislenta, Celestine, 376.
Missions, popish, 16th cent., 73, &c., 84, &c., 125, &c.; 17th cent., 243, &c., 245, &c., 247, &c.; 18th cent., 482, &c.
————, Protestant, 16th cent., 75, &c.; 17th 258, &c., 262, &c.; 18th, 484.
Mogilaus, Peter, 115.
Molina, Lewis, 110, &c., 327, &c.
Molinos, Michael de, 339–341, n. (205).
Monarchy, Fifth, 417.
Monks, 16th cent., 13, &c., 87, &c., 94, &c.; 17th cent., 311, &c.
Monophysites: see *Jacobites*.
Montaigne, Michael le, 76, n. (10).
Montanus, Benedict Arius, 98, n. (41).
Montfaucon, Bernhard, 319, n. (117), 321.
Moore, Henry, 278.
Moors expelled from Spain, 291.
Morality: see *Religion* and *Theology*, practical.
Moravians, 183, &c., 489.
Morgan, Thomas, 484.
Morin, John, 319, n. (119), 321, 346, n. (4).
Moulin, Peter du, 358.
Moyer, lady, 494.
Muller, Henry, 366, n. (17).
————, John, 366, n. (17).
Munster, seat of Anabaptists, 58, 205, &c.
Munzer, Thomas, 38, n. (47), 202.
Muralt, deistic writer, 485.
Musæus, Peter, 359, 366, n. (17).
————, John, 366, n. (17), 377.
Musculus, Wolfgang, 192.
Mystics, 18, 104, 326, 339, &c., 454, 455, &c., n. (19).

N.

Nagel, Paul, 392.
Nantes, edict of, 174, n. (37), 396, n. (5).
Naples, reformation in, 72, n. (15).
Narsius, John, 443.
Nassau, joins the Reformed, 185.
Natalis Alexander, 306, 320, n. (135).
National covenant, Scotch, 418, note, 422, note.
Nayler, James, 450, n. (5).
Neercassel, John, 335.
Nerius, Philip, canonized, 96, 344.
Nessel, Daniel, 301, n. (65).
Nestorians. 16th cent., 85, &c., 121, &c., 126; 17th, 354, &c.; 18th, 487.
Netherlands reformation in, 49, &c., n. (66), 70.
Neuser, Adam, 237.
Newton, Sir Isaac, 272, 281.
Newburg, dispute at, 293.
Nicolai, Henry, 220.
Nicole, Peter, 299, n. (45), 317, 320, n. (125)
Nihusius, Barthold, 298, n. (43), 301.
Nikon, Russian patriarch, 350, n. (12).
Noailles, Lewis Anthony de, 486.
Nobili, Robert de, 247, &c., n. (9).
Noll, Henry, 275, n. (66).
Nominalists, 15.
Nonconformists, 177, 425, 491.
Nonjurors, 425, &c., n. (74), 427.
Nordlingen, city, protested, 42, n. (51).
Noris, Henry, 321, n. (145).
Nuremberg, diet of, 33, 34.
————, peace of, 56, 57.
————, city, protested, 42, n. (51).

O.

Ochin, Bernardin, 71, n. (15), 76, n. (10), 196, 229, note.
Œcolampadius, John, 162, 192.
Olaus Petri, 44.
Oldenbarnevelt, John van, 437, 438, 439.
Olearius, John, &c., 366, n. (17).
Olympia Maldachini, 283, n. (2).
Opposers of religion or Deists, in the 16th cent., 76, &c.; 17th, 265, &c., 422; 18th, 484, &c.
Oratory of the Holy Jesus, fathers of, 314.
Oriental church, 113, &c.: see *Greek* church.
——— literature, 273.
Osiander, Andrew, 137, 150, n. (42), 151, 367, n. (17).
————, Lucas, 367, n. (17), 388, 390.
————, John Adam, 367, n. (17).
Ostorodt, Christopher, 237.
Owerra, Capuchin mission to, 260.

P.

Pactiis, Maria Magdalena de, canonized, 344.
Pajon, Claude, 406, &c.
Palæologus, James, 241, n. (45).
Palatinate church, 397, 493.
Pall of archbishops, 83, n. (5).
Pallavicini, Sfortia, 321, n. (141).
Pamelius, James, 99, n. (41).
Panagiota, a Greek, 115.
Pantheists, 269, 270, n. (52).
Papal power, in 16th cent., 8, &c., 81, &c., 83, 92, &c., 106; in 17th, 304, 308, &c., n. (81), 485.
Papebroch, Daniel, 322, n. (155).
Papin, Isaac, 407, n. (39).
Paracelsus, Theophilus, 76, 77, note, 79.
Paraguay, mission to, 261, n. (29).
Paris, Francis de, 487.
Parthenius, patriarch of Constantinople, 348.
Particularists, 402, n. (22).
Pascal, Blaise, 317, 320, n. (126).
Passau, treaty of, 65, n. (6).
Passive obedience to kings, 427.
Paul III., pope, 57, 91, n. (22), 95.
—— IV., pope, 91, n. (25), 95.
—— V., pope, 283, 304, 305, 328.
Peace of Augsburg, 65, &c.
—— of Westphalia, 289.
Peasants, war of, 37, &c.
Pellican, Conrad, 197.
Penitence, Jesuit idea of, 324

Penitence, Jansenist, 336–338.
Penn, William, 452.
Pennsylvania, 264, 453.
Peripatetics: see *Aristotelians*.
Perkins, William, 193, n. (79).
Perrieres, Bonaventure des, 76, n. (10).
Perron, James David, 322, n. (156).
Persecutions, in 16th cent., 47, &c., n. (60), 49, n. (62)–(64), 59, 60, 67–72, 76, 177; in 17th, 256, &c., 290, n. (19), 395, 396, 397, 417, &c., n. (58), 425, 443, 469, 475.
Perth, five articles of, 418, note.
Petavius, Dionysius, 318, n. (103), 321.
Peter the Great, of Russia, 350, &c.
——, the Maronite patriarchs, 352, n. (17).
Petersen, John William, 386, n. (34).
Petrobrusians, 201, note.
Petrucci, Peter Matthew, 341, n. (207).
Peucer, Casper, 152, 153.
Peyrere, Isaac la, 343, n. (211).
Pezel's Catechism, Calvinistic, 152.
Pfaff, Christopher Matthew, 491.
Pfeffercorn, John, 13, n. (10).
Pfeiffer, John Philip, 301.
———, Augustus, 366, n. (17).
Pflug, Julius, 63.
Philadelphian society, 481.
Philip, landgrave of Hesse, 43, 62, 64, 162.
—— II., king of Spain, 70.
Philology cultivated, in 16th cent., 78.
Philosophy, in the 16th cent., 15, 78, &c., 97, &c., 134, &c., 191, &c.; in 17th, 271, &c., 274, &c., 316, &c., 362, &c., 397, &c., 428, &c.; in 18th, 488, 489, 490.
Philosophical sin; 107, n. (56), 324, &c.
Physical depravity, asserted, 149.
Piarists, monks, 315.
Pictet, Benedict, 399, n. (13).
Pietists, whence the name, 380, note.
Pietistic controversies, 369, 377–387, 490.
Pighi, Albert, 98, n. (41).
Pin, Lewis Ellies du, 306, 323, n. (170).
Pinczovians, sect, 230, 234, n. (25).
Pirckheimer, 14, n. (12).
Pisa, council of, A.D. 1511, 10, n. (5).
Piscator, John, 192, 403, n. (25).
Pius III., pope, 9.
—— IV., pope, 91, n. (26).
—— V., pope, 91, &c., n. (27).
Placæus, Joshua, 405, &c. n. (31).
Placette, John la, 399, n. (13).
Platonists, in 17th cent., 278.
Plymouth, Massachusetts, missions, 262, &c., n. (32).
Podoniptæ, Mennonite sect, 215.
Poiret, Peter, 481.
Poland, reformation of, 50, n. (65), 182, &c., 229, &c., 290, 475.
Pole, Reginald, 68, n. (9).
Polemic theology: see *Theology*, polemic.
Politianus, Angelus, 76, n. (10), 98, n. (41).
Pöllenburg, Arnold, 444, n. (20).
Pomponatius, Peter, 76, n. (10).
Poniatowski, Christina, 391.
Pontianis, Francisca de, canonized, 344.
Pontiffs: see *Roman* pontiffs.
Popofitschins, sect, 350, n. (12).
Pordage, John, 481, n. (8).
Port-Royal, convent, 313, 319, n. (122), 327, 330, 337, n. (200), 338.
Portugal, contest with the pope, 305, &c.
Possevin, Anthony, 125, 286, 320, n. (132).
Possin, Peter, 318, n. (105), 321.
Potter, John, archbishop of Canterbury, 492.
Powder-plot, 291.
Præadamites, 343.
Prætorius, Stephen, 390.
———, Matthew, 294, 301.
Pragmatic Sanction, 11.
Preaching, before Luther, 16.
Predestination: see *Grace*, 344, n. (215), 357, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 423, 436, &c., 447.
Presbyterians, 400, 409, 411, 416, n. (57), 417, n. (58); Scotch, 417–422, notes; English, 419–422, notes, 491.
Prierias, Sylvester, 22.
Priests for foreign missions, 244, 245, 249.
——— of the Missions, 314, &c.
Probabilism, moral, 107, n. (54), 324.
Prophets, in 17th cent., 392.
Protestants, rise of, 39–42, n. (51), 61–66.
——— reconciled to popery, 299, &c.
Provincial Letters, Pascal's, 324, n. (177).
Puffendorf, Samuel, 363.
Punishment, future, its nature, 434.
Puritans, 68, n. (10), 176–182, 197, 262, 411, 419, note, 491.

Q.

Quakers, 422, 448–469.
Quesnel, Paschasius, 326, 486.
Quietists, 339, 340, 341.
Quinquarticulans, 446, n. (25).

R.

Rabelais, Francis, 76, n. (10).
Racovian Catechism, 235, 239, n. (40).
Racow or Racovia, seat of Unitarians, 231, n. (22), 235, 474, 475.
Ramsay, Chevalier Andrew Michael. 342, n. (210).
Ramus, Peter, and *Ramists*, 79, 134, n. (9), 363.
Rance, Arm. Jo. Bouth. de, 313, n. (93).
Ranzovius, Christopher, 300, n. (55).
Raskolniks, Russian sect, 349, &c., n. (11), (12).
Rathmann, Herman, 388, 389.
Ratisbon, diet, 60; disputation, 293.
Raymond of Pennafort, canonized, 344.
Raynald, Odoric, 96.
Raynard, Theophilus, 321, n. (139).
Recollets, Franciscan monks, 94.
Reconciliation of Protestants with papists, 293–297, 404, &c., 485, 492.
——— of Lutherans and Reformed, 357, &c., 491.
Refined Mennonites, 470.
Reformation, desired, 8, &c., 17.
———, history of, chap. i. (state of the church), 8, &c.; ch. ii. (to A.D. 1530), 18, &c.; ch. iii. (to A.D. 1546), 51, &c.; ch. iv. (to A.D. 1555), 61, &c.
Reformed church, history of, in the 16th cent., 159, &c.; in 17th, 394, &c.; in 18th, 490, &c.
Reformed monks, 311, &c., n. (87).
Régale, right of, 308, 310.
Regius, Urban, 159.
Regular clergy, 322: see *Monks*.
Reichard, George, 391.
Reinerus Reineccius, 133.
Reinboth, John, 389, 476.

Religion, state of, in 16th cent., 16, 79, 112; in 17th, 323, &c., 335.
Remonstrants, 436: see *Arminians*.
Reservation, ecclesiastical, 131.
Reservations, mental, 324.
Restitution Edict, 288.
Restoration of all things, 386, n. (34), 481, 490.
Reuchlin, John, 13.
Revenue, papal, 11, &c., n. (7), 83, n. (5).
Reutlingen, city, protested, 42, n. (51).
Rheinsbergers, Collegiants, 478.
Rhodes, Alexander de, 248, n. (10).
Ricci, Matthew, 75, n. (8), 252.
Richelieu, John Armand, 294, 298, 322, n. (161), 395, 396.
Richer, Edmund, 103, n. (50), 306.
Rigorists, 335, n. (198).
Rivet, Andrew, 404, 428.
Riviers, John, 138, n. (19).
Robinson, John, Independent, 413, note.
Rochester, John Wilmot, earl of, 266.
Roderich, Christopher, 85.
Roel, Herman Alexander, 431, n. (85), 492.
Römeling, Anthony, 488.
Roman pontiffs, 16th cent., 8, &c., 91, &c.; 17th, 282, &c.; 18th, 485.
Rose, an American nun, canonized, 344.
Rosecrucians, 274, n. (60), 391.
Rosenbach, John George, 488.
Roskolskika, Russian sect, 349, n. (11).
Rost, George, 390.
Roxas, Christopher de, 295, &c., n. (37).
Royal Societies, London and Paris, 272.
Rue, Charles de la, 318, n. (115).
Ruggeri, Cosmo, 268.
Ruinart, Theodore, 318, n. (112), 321.
Russians, 116, 125, 349, &c., n. (11), (12), 487.
Rys, Hans de, 210, n. (19).

S.

Sabians, Christians of St. John, 122.
Sacramentarian controversy, 35–37, 43, 53, &c., n. (2), 142, 174, 175, 162, 166, 167, 169, n. (25), 187.
Sacy, Isaac de, 326, n. (180), 338, n. (200).
Sadolet, James, 98, n. (41).
Sales, Francis de, canonized, 337, 344.
Saltzburgers, 362, n. (11), 488.
Samson, Bernardin, 27.
Sanches, Francis, 281.
Sancroft, William, archbishop, 425.
Sand, Christopher, 477, n. (10).
Saracens, expelled Spain, 291.
Sarcerius, Erasmus, 159.
Sarpi, Paul, 304, 305, notes, 321, n. (140).
Satan, his power disputed, 432, 433.
Satisfaction of Christ, 403, n. (25).
Saurin, James, 493.
Saxony, visitation of churches, 41, n. (50).
Scacchi, Fortunatus, 321, n. (147).
Schade, John Casper, 378, 387.
Schall, John Adam, missionary, 251.
Scharf, John, 372.
Schenk, James, 144, n. (28).
Schertzer, John Adam, 366, n. (17).
Schmid, Sebastian, 367, n. (17), 369.
———, Lawrence, 490.
Schomann, George, 232, n. (24), 234, n. (25).
Schomer, Justus Christopher, 367. n. (17), 369.
Schools, 14, 15, 97, 316, &c., 382, &c.
Schools, brethren and sisters of the Christian, 315.
Schurmann, Anna Maria, 480.
Schwenckfeld, Casper, 141, n. (24), 142, &c.
Scioppius, Casper, 286, 300, n. (56).
Scotland, reformation in, 49, n. (64), 69, n. (11), 174, &c., n. (38).
Scriptures, holy, 99, 102, 129, 186, 231, 237, &c., 431, 457, 490.
Scultetus, Abraham, 287, n. (12).
Secular clergy, 322: see *Clergy*.
Seguenot, Claude, 321, n. (151).
Seidelius, Martin, 393.
Seidenbecher, George Lawrence, 393.
Seizen, John Christopher, 488.
Selnecker, Nicholas, 154.
Seminaries de Propaganda, 243–245.
Semi-Judaizers, 241, 393, n. (48).
Semi-Universalists, 402, n. (22).
Sendomir, convention of, 183.
Senensis, Sixtus, 98, n. (41).
Sententiarii Baccalaurii, 103, n. (51).
Serapion, Armenian patriarch, 85.
Serrarius, Nicholas, 320, n. (130).
Servetus, Michael, 223, &c., n. (8).
Severinus, Peter, 135, n. (12).
Sfondrati, Cœlestine, 309, n. (82), 321, n. (143), 344, n. (215).
Shaftsbury, earl of, 266, &c., n. (41).
Sharroch, English writer, 400.
Shepherd, Thomas, 262, 263, note.
Siam, missions to, 248, 249, n. (12).
Sidonius, Michael, 63.
Sienienius, John, 231.
Sienno, James à, 235.
Sigismund, John, elector of Brandenburgh, 356, &c.
Simon, Richard, 319, n. (121), 321.
Sins, philosophical, 107, n. (56), 324, 325.
Sirmond, James, 318, n. (104), 321.
Six articles of Henry VIII., 60, n. (14).
Sixtus V., pope, 92, n. (29).
—— Senensis, 98, n. (41).
Skeptics, 281, 428.
Smalcald, league of, 55, &c.
———, articles of, 58, n. (10).
———, war of, 61, &c.
Smalcius, Valentine, 239, n. 40).
Smyth, John, a general Baptist, 219, n. (35), 473, n. (10).
Socinus, Lælius, 221, 222, 228, &c., n. (14), 235, n. (28).
———, Faustus, 221, 222, 234, &c., 241, n. (46).
Socinians, history of, in 16th cent., 221, &c.; in 17th, 474, &c.; in 18th, 493, &c.
Sohner, Ernest, 474, n. (1).
Somasquo, Fathers of, 95.
Sommer, John, 241, n. (45).
Son of God, opinion of Roel, 431, n. (84).
Space, Cartesian idea of, 428.
Spain, reformation in, 48, n. (61), 72.
——, expulsion of Moors, 291.
Spangenburg, Cyriac, 149.
Spanheim, Frederic, 404, 428.
Spener, Philip James, 367, n. (17), 370, 377, &c., n. (27).
Sperber, Julius, 275, n. (67).
Spilsbury, John, 473, note.
Spinoza, Benedict, 268, &c., n. (50), (51), 280 484.

Spire, diets of, 40, 42, 61.
Spirituals, in France, 194.
Stancarus, Francis, 151.
Statorius, Peter, 230, n. (15).
Stenonius, Nicholas, 301, n. (60).
Sterowerzi or *Staroverisi*, 350, n. (11).
Stiefel, Esaias, 392.
Storck, Nicholas, 202.
Strasburg, city, protested, 42, n. (51).
Strigelius, Victorin, 137, 147, 148, 149.
Strigolniks, sect, 350, n. (12).
Stubner, Mark, 202.
Substitution, 423, n. (64).
Sulaka, John, Nestorian, 85, 122.
Supralapsarians, 400, 401, 402, n. (22), 491.
Surinam, Dutch mission to, 264, n. (33).
Surius, Lawrence, 98, n. (41).
Susneius, emperor of Abyssinia, 302.
Sweden, reformation of, 44, &c.
Switzerland, reformation in, 27, &c., n. (30).
Swiss churches, 434, &c., 447, 493.
Symbolical books, Lutheran, 129, 368.
Syncretistic controversy, 371–377.
Synergistic controversy, 147–149.
Synod of Dort, 401, 402, 440–443.
———, Holy, of Russia, 351, n. (14).
Synods, national, of France, 172, note.
Szegedin, Stephen, 184.

T.

Tackanash, John, 263, note.
Tanner, Adam, 286.
Tarnovius, John, 366, n. (17), 389.
———, Paul, 366, n. (17).
Taurellus, Nicholas, 76, 78, note.
Taxa Cancellaria apostolica, 11, n. (7).
Telesius, Bernhard, 79.
Teling, William, 193, n. (80).
Tennhart, John, 488.
Test Act, 425.
Tetzel, John, 21, n. (18), 22, 23.
Theatins, monks, 95.
Theology, biblical, in the 16th cent., 15, 79, 102, &c., 137, 192; in 17th, 326, 369, 398, 429, &c.
———, didactic, in 16th cent., 15, 79, 99–104, 137, 138, 192, 237–239, 240; in 17th, 323, &c., 326, 369, &c., 382, &c., 399; in 18th, 488.
———, practical, in 16th cent., 79, 104, 138, &c., 193, &c., 238, &c.; in 17th, 273, 324, 325, 370, &c., 382, &c., 399, &c.
———, polemic, in 16th cent., 15, 103, 104, &c., 139, 158; in 17th, 327, 365, 370, 382, &c., 400, &c.
Theophrastus Paracelsus: see *Paracelsus*.
Theosophists, 79, 135, &c., 274.
Theresia, St., 94, 344.
Thienæus, Cajetan, canonized, 345.
Thiers, John Baptist, 322, n. (169).
Thirty years' war, 286–289.
Thomas Christians, India, 86, 354, &c.
Thomasius, Christian, 363, 364, n. (15), 366, 380, note.
Thomassin, Lewis, 319, n. (120), 321.
Thorn, conference of, 293, 359, 373, note.
Thought, the essence of spirit, 428.
Tillemont, Sebastian le Nain de, 320, n. (123).
Thoyras, Rapin, 412, n. (52).
Tindal, William, 49, n. (64).
———, Matthew, 484.
Titelmann, Francis, 103.
Toland, John, 267, 484.
Toleration, 54, &c., 66, n. (7), 171, &c., 418, note, 419, note, 420, note, 421, note, 422, note, 425, 445, &c., 469, 473, 492.
———, Act of, 425, n. (70).
Tonquin, missions to, 248.
Torgau, Articles of, 44.
———, convention of, 153.
Tories, ecclesiastical, 424.
Tournon, cardinal, 48, n. (60), 483.
Tradition, 99, 102.
Transubstantiation, in Greek church, 348, &c.
Transylvania, 184, 235, &c., 474, 493.
Trappe, de la, 313.
Treasury, papal, 11, 83, n. (5).
Treat, Samuel, 264, n. (32).
Trent, council of, 61–62, 64, 93, 99–101.
Trinity, unknown under the Old Testament, 374, note, 376.
Tryers, 30, under Cromwell, 422, n. (58).
Tubingen divines, with Greeks, 116.
Tupper, Samuel, 264, n. (32).
Turrianus, Francis, 98, n. (41).
———, Augustine, 373, note.
Tzetch, Theodore von, 391.

U.

Ubiquity of Christ's body, 156, n. (53), 157, 166, &c., 388, n. (36).
Ueberfeld, John William, 488.
Uke Walles and *Ukewallists*, 470, &c., n. (5).
Ulm, city, protested, 42, n. (51).
Uniformity, Act of, 177, 422, n. (58), 425, n. (68).
Unigenitus, bull, 485.
Unitarian Brethren, and *Unitarians*, 222, 234, &c., 477: see *Socinians*, *Arians*.
United Brethren, in England, 416, n. (57).
United Greeks, who, 125, &c.
Universalists, who, 402, n. (22), 404, 491.
Universities, Protestant, 133.
Urban VIII., pope, 282, 306.
Ursinus, Zachariah, 171.
Ursulines, nuns, 96.

V.

Valerius, Magnus, 300, n. (51).
Vanini, Julius Cæsar, 267, &c., n. (45).
Vatablus, Francis, 98, n. (41).
Vayer, Francis de la Mothe le, 281.
Venetian Unitarians, 228, &c., n. (14).
Venetians resist the popes, 304, 305.
Veri, Anthony, 483.
Veron, Francis, 298, n. (42).
Verschoor, James, 433, &c.
Vetteria, Anna, 391.
Viles or Vives, John Baptist, 244.
Villa Nova, Thomas de, canonized, 344.
Vincent de Paul, 315.
Viret, Peter, 197.
Virgins of Love, 315.
Visconti, Joseph, 323, n. (175).
Visitation of churches, Saxon, 41, n. (50); English, 67, n. (8), (9), 68, n. (10).
Vitringa, Campeius, 431.
Voet, Gisbert, 398, 427, 428.
Voidovius, Andrew, 237.
Völkel, John, 476, n. (8).
Volusius, Adolphus Godfrey, 294.
Vorstius, Conrad, 443.

Vries, Gerhard de, 431.
Vulgate Bible, 102.

W.

Wahl, Adrian van der, 443.
Wake, William, archbishop, 491, note, 492.
Waldensians, 48, n. (60), 184, n. (57), 200, n. (4), 290, n. (21), 397, n. (7).
Wadenberg, Peter and Adrian, 298, n. (44).
Wallis, John, 280.
Walther, Balthasar, 391.
———, Michael, 366, n. (27).
———, Marcus, 443.
Wandsworth, first Presbyterian church in England, 419, note.
Wansleben, John Michael, 353, n. (21).
War of the Peasants, 37, &c.
—— of Smalcald, 62.
Waterlanders, 210, 215, &c., 470, 471.
Wayen, John van der, 431.
Weigel, Valerius, 135.
———, Valentine, 390.
Weissenburg, in Transylvania, 236, n. (30).
———, city, protested, 42, n. (51).
Weller, Jerome, 138, n. (18).
———, James, 366, n. (17), 372.
Werdenhagen, John Angelus von, 391.
Werenfels, Peter, 435, n. (90).
Wessel, Gisbert, 431.
West Indies (America), missions to, 260.
Westminster assembly, 419, &c., note.
———— Catechisms and Confession, 420, note.
Westphal, Joachim, 164.
Westphalia, peace of, 289.
Wetstein, John James, 444, n. (20).
Whichcot, Benjamin, 278.
Whiston, William, 493.
White, Thomas, 343, n. (212).
Whitefield, George, 492.
Wigand, John, 159.
William, Prince of Orange, 70, 216.
———— III., king of England, 292, 425.
———— VI., landgrave of Hesse, 359.
William Christian, marquis of Brandenburg, 300, n. (50).
———— Wolfgang, count Palatine, 300, n. (49).
Williams, Roger, 473, note.
Wilmot, John, earl of Rochester, 266.
Windsheim, city, protested, 42, n. (51).
Wissowatius, Andrew, 476, n. (8).
Wittemberg, 19, 30, 32, &c.
Wolf, Christopher, 489.
Wolfgang, prince of Anhalt, protests, 42, n. (51).
Woolston, Thomas, 484.
Works, good, controversy on, 146, &c.
Worms, diets of, 30, 31, 61.
———, Conference of, 60.
Worship, public, Greek, 117, 118, 119, 120.
———, Romish, 16, 112, 344.
———, Lutheran, 129, &c.
———, Reformed, 161.
———, English, 176, 177, n. (40), 178, 179.
———, Quaker, 457, 462, 463.
Writers, Catholic, in 16th cent., 98; 17th, 320–323.
———, Lutheran, 16th cent., 159; 17th, 366-367.
———, Reformed, 16th cent., 197; 17th, 397, n. (8).

X.

Xavier, St. Francis, 74, n. (5)

Y.

Yvon, Peter, 480, n. (4).

Z.

Zaccagni, Lawrence Alexander, 323, n. (172).
Zacharias, Antony Mavia, 95.
Zanchius, Jerome, 165.
Zimmermann, John James, 391.
Zingha, Anna, 260.
Zinzindorf, count, 489.
Zwingle, Ulrich, 27, n. (30), 28, 37, n. (45), 43, 54, n. (2), 141, 162, 163, 164, 167, 168, 169, 170, 191, 192, 197.

THE END.

VALUABLE WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

HARPER & BROTHERS,

NEW-YORK.

The following Catalogue will be found to contain a great number of Works suitable for Circulating, School, and District Libraries; all of which may be had on the most reasonable Terms

The History of Modern Europe; with a View of the Progress of Society, from the Rise of the Modern Kingdoms to the Peace of Paris in 1763. By William Russell, LL.D.: and a Continuation of the History to the present Time, by William Jones, Esq. With Annotations by an American. In 3 vols. 8vo. With Engravings, &c. Sheep extra.

The History of the Discovery and Settlement of America. By William Robertson, D.D. With an Account of his Life and Writings.

The History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles V.; with a View of the Progress of Society in Europe, from the Subversion of the Roman Empire to the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century. By William Robertson, D.D.

The History of Scotland, during the Reigns of Queen Mary and of King James VI., till his Accession to the Crown of England. With a review of the Scottish History previous to that Period. Including the History of India.

The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. By Edward Gibbon, Esq. Complete in 4 vols. 8vo. With Maps and Engravings. Sheep extra.

View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages. By Henry Hallam. From the sixth London Edition. Complete in one vol.

ROLLIN.—The Ancient History of the Egyptians, Carthaginians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes and Persians, Grecians and Macedonians; including the History of the Arts and Sciences of the Ancients. By Charles Rollin. With a Life of the Author, by James Bell. First complete American Edition. 8vo. Embellished with nine Engravings, including three Maps.

The Dramatic Works and Poems of William Shakspeare. With Notes, original and selected, and introductory Remarks to each Play, by Samuel Weller Singer, F.S.A., and a Life of the Poet, by Charles Symmons, D.D. Complete in one vol. 8vo. With twenty Engravings. Sheep extra.

The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare, with the Corrections and Illustrations of Dr. Johnson, G Stevens, and others. Revised by Isaac Reed, Esq. In 6 vols. crown 8vo. With a Portrait and other Engravings. Fancy muslin.

The Works of Henry Mackenzie, Esq. Complete in one vol. 12mo. With a Portrait.

Prideaux's Connexions; or, the Old and New Testaments connected, in the History of the Jews and neighbouring Nations; from the Declension of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah to the Time of Christ. By Humphrey Prideaux, D.D., Dean of Norwich. New Edition. To which is prefixed, the Life of the Author, containing some Letters which he wrote in Defence and Illustration of certain Parts of his Connexions. In 2 vols. 8vo. With Maps and Engravings. Sheep extra.

Plutarch's Lives. Translated from the original Greek, with Notes, critical and historical, and a Life of Plutarch. By John Langhorne, D.D., and William Langhorne, A.M. A new Edition, carefully revised and corrected.

The same Work in 4 elegant 12mo. volumes, large type. Sheep extra.

The Works of Joseph Addison. Complete in 3 vols. 8vo., embracing "The Spectator." Portrait.

The Works of Edmund Burke. With a Memoir. In 3 vols. 8vo. With a Portrait.

The Works of Charles Lamb. With his Life, &c., by Talfourd Portrait. 2 vols.

The Works of John Dryden, in Verse and Prose. With a Life, by the Rev. John Mitford. In 2 vols. 8vo. With a Portrait.

The Works of Hannah More. In 7 vols. 12mo. Illustrations to each Volume.

The same work in 2 vols. royal 8vo., with Illustrations. Fancy Muslin.

Also an Edition in one vol. royal 8vo., with a Portrait, &c. Fancy muslin.

Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Hannah More. By William Roberts.

Sermons of the Rev. James Saurin, late Pastor of the French Church at the Hague. From the French, by the Rev. Robert Robinson, Rev. Henry Hunter, D.D., and Rev. Joseph Sutcliffe, A.M. A new Edition, with additional Sermons. Revised and corrected by the Rev. Samuel Burder, A.M. Sheep extra.

A History of the Church, from the earliest Ages to the Reformation. By the Rev. George Waddington, A.M. 8vo. Sheep.

A new Hieroglyphical Bible, with 400 Cuts by Adams. 16mo.

The Book of Nature. By John Mason Good, M.D., F.R.S. To which is now prefixed, a Sketch of the Author's Life. 8vo. Sheep extra.

Essays on the Principles of Morality, and on the private and political Rights and Obligations of Mankind. By Jonathan Dymond With a Preface, by the Rev. George Bush, M.A.

The Percy Anecdotes. Revised Edition. To which is added, a valuable Collection of American Anecdotes, original and selected.

English Synonymes. With copious Illustrations and Explanations, drawn from the best Writers. By George Crabb, M.A. 8vo. Sheep.

Letters and Journals of Lord Byron. With Notices of his Life. By Thomas Moore, Esq. In 2 vols. 8vo. With a Portrait Sheep.

The Study of Medicine. By John Mason Good, M.D., F.R.S. Improved from the Author's Manuscripts, and by Reference to the latest Advances in Physiology, Pathology, and Practice. By Samuel Cooper, M.D. With Notes, by A. Sidney Doane, A.M., M.D.

Midwifery Illustrated. By J. P. Maygrier, M.D Translated from the French, with Notes. By A. Sidney Doane, A.M., M.D. With 82 Plates. Fancy muslin.

Lexicon Medicum; or, Medical Dictionary. By R. Hooper, M.D. With Additions from American Authors, by Samuel Akerly.

A Treatise on Topographical Anatomy; or, the Anatomy of the Regions of the Human Body, considered in its Relations with Surgery and operative Medicine. With an Atlas of twelve Plates. By Ph. Fred. Blandin, Professor of Anatomy and operative Medicine, etc. Translated from the original French, by A. Sidney Doane, A.M., M.D. With additional Matter and Plates. 8vo. Sheep.

Elements of the Etiology and Philosophy of Epidemics. By Joseph Mather Smith, M.D. 8vo.

ANTHON'S SERIES OF CLASSICAL WORKS

for Schools and Colleges, now in the course of publication.

☞ The following works, already published, may be regarded as specimens of the whole series, which will consist of about thirty volumes.

Sallust's Jugurthine War and Conspiracy of Catiline, with an English Commentary, and Geographical and Historical Indexes. By Charles Anthon, LL.D. Sixth Edition, corrected and enlarged. 12mo. With a Portrait.

Select Orations of Cicero; with an English Commentary, and Historical, Geographical, and Legal Indexes. By Charles Anthon, LL.D.

Cæsar's Commentaries on the Gallic War; and the first Book of the Greek Paraphrase; with English Notes, critical and explanatory, Plans of Battles, Sieges, &c., and Historical, Geographical, and Archæological Indexes. By Charles Anthon, LL.D.

A Grammar of the Greek Language, for the Use of Schools and Colleges, with Teutonic, Gothic, Sclavonic, Gaelic, Sanscrit and Zend Analogies. By Charles Anthon, LL.D. 12mo.

A System of Greek Prosody and Metre, with Illustrations of the Choral Scanning in the Dramatic Writers. By Charles Anthon, LL.D.

An Elementary Treatise on Anatomy By A. L. J. Bayle. Translated from the sixth French Edition, by A. Sidney Doane, A.M., M.D. 18mo.

Surgery Illustrated. Compiled from the Works of Cutler, Hind, Velpeau, and Blasius. By A. Sidney Doane, A.M., M.D. With 52 Plates. Fancy muslin.

A Dictionary of Practical Surgery. By S. Cooper, M.D. With numerous Notes and Additions, embracing all the principal American Improvements.

A Treatise on Epidemic Cholera, as observed in the Duane-street Cholera Hospital, New-York, during its Prevalence there in 1834. By Floyd T. Ferris. 8vo. Plates.

Memoirs of Aaron Burr. With Miscellaneous Selections from his Correspondence. By Matthew L. Davis. 2 vols. 8vo. With Portraits.

The Works of the Rev. Robert Hall, A.M. With a brief Memoir of his Life, by Dr. Gregory, and Observations on his Character as a Preacher, by the Rev. John Forster. Edited by Olinthus Gregory, LL.D. In 3 vols. 8vo.

A Dictionary of the Holy Bible. Containing an Historical Account of the Persons; a Geographical Account of Places; a Literal, Critical, and Systematical Description of other Objects, whether Natural, Artificial, Civil, Religious, or Military; and an Explanation of the Appellative Terms mentioned in the Old and New Testaments. By the Rev. John Brown, of Haddington. With a Life of the Author, and an Essay on the Evidences of Christianity.

Voyage of the United States Frigate Potomac, under the command of Com. John Downes, during the Circumnavigation of the Globe, in the Years 1831, 1832, 1833, 1834; including a particular Account of the Engagement at Quallah Battoo, on the Coast of Sumatra, with all the official Documents relating to the same. By J. N. Reynolds. 8vo. Illustrated with ten Steel Engravings. Fancy muslin.

Embassy to the Eastern Courts of Siam, Cochin-China, and Muscat. By Edmund Roberts. 8vo.

A Journal of Travels on the Continent of Europe: viz., in England, Ireland, Scotland, France, Italy, Switzerland, some parts of Germany, and the Netherlands, during the Years 1835 and '36. By Wilbur Fisk, D.D. 8vo. With Engravings.

The Fairy Book. 16mo. Illustrated with 81 Woodcuts by Adams. Fancy muslin, gilt edges.

The Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, of York, Mariner. With a Biographical Account of De Foe. Illustrated with fifty characteristic Engravings by Adams.

The Pilgrim's Progress. With a Life of Bunyan, by Robert Southey, LL.D. New and beautiful Edition, splendidly illustrated with fifty Engravings by Adams.

Poems by William Cullen Bryant. New Editon, enlarged. 12mo. With a Vignette Fancy muslin.

The same Work, fancy muslin, gilt edges

The same Work, bound in silk, gilt edges.

A Life of Washington. By J. K. Paulding, Esq. 2 vols. With Engravings.

The Poor Rich Man and the Rich Poor Man. By Miss C. M. Sedgwick.

Live and let Live; or, Domestic Service Illustrated. By Miss C. M. Sedgwick.

A Life of George Washington. In Latin Prose. By Francis Glass, A.M., of Ohio. Edited by J. N. Reynolds. 12mo. Portrait.

Initia Latina, or the Rudiments of the Latin Tongue. Illustrated by Progressive Exercises. By Charles H. Lyon. 12mo.

Miniature Lexicon of the English Language. 32mo. By Lyman Cobb.

Incidents of Travel in Egypt, Arabia Petræa, and the Holy Land. By an American. 2 vols. 12mo. Fifth Edition. Engravings.

A Year in Spain. By a Young American. In 3 vols. 12mo. Vignette Embellishments. Fancy muslin.

Spain Revisited. By the Author of "A Year in Spain." In 2 vols. 12mo. Fancy muslin.

Polynesian Researches, during a Residence of nearly eight Years in the Society and Sandwich Islands. By William Ellis. In 4 vols. 12mo. With Maps, &c.

Travels and Researches in Caffraria; describing the Character, Customs, and Moral Condition of the Tribes inhabiting that portion of Southern Africa. By Stephen Kay. 12mo. With Maps, &c.

Evidence of the Truth of the Christian Religion, derived from the literal Fulfilment of Prophecy. By Rev. Alex. Keith. 12mo.

Zion's Songster. Compiled by Rev. Thomas Mason. 48mo.

The Letters of the British Spy. By William Wirt, Esq. To which is prefixed, a Biographical Sketch of the Author. 12mo. With a Portrait.

Directions for Invigorating and Prolonging Life; or, the Invalid's Oracle. By Wm. Kitchiner, M.D. Improved by T. S. Barrett, M.D.

The Cook's Oracle and Housekeeper's Manual. Containing Receipts for Cookery, and Directions for Carving. With a Complete System of Cookery for Catholic Families. By William Kitchiner, M.D. 12mo.

Modern American Cookery. With a List of Family Medical Receipts, and a Valuable Miscellany. By Miss P. Smith. 16mo.

The Dramatic Works of John Ford. With Notes Critical and Explanatory. In 2 vols. 18mo.

Wonderful Characters; comprising Memoirs and Anecdotes of the most Remarkable Persons of every Age and Nation. By Henry Wilson. 8vo. Engravings.

A Narrative of Four Voyages to the South Sea, North and South Pacific Ocean, Chinese Sea, Ethiopic and Southern Atlantic Ocean, and Antarctic Ocean. From the year 1822 to 1831. Comprising an Account of some valuable Discoveries, including the Massacre Islands, where thirteen of the Author's Crew were massacred and eaten by Cannibals. By Capt. Benjamin Morrell, Jun. 8vo.

The Plays of Philip Massinger. In 3 vols. 18mo. With a Portrait.

Narrative of a Voyage to the South Seas, in 1829-1831. By Abbey Jane Morrell, who accompanied her Husband, Capt. Benjamin Morrell, Jun., of the Schooner Antarctic. 12mo.

The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket. Comprising the Details of a Mutiny and atrocious Butchery on board the American Brig Grampus, on her way to the South Seas, in the Month of June, 1827. With an Account of the Recapture of the Vessel by the Survivers; their Shipwreck and subsequent horrible Sufferings from Famine; their Deliverance by Means of the British Schooner Jane Guy; the brief Cruise of this latter Vessel in the Antarctic Ocean; her Capture, and the Massacre of her Crew, among a Group of Islands in the *eighty-fourth Parallel of Southern Latitude;* together with the incredible Adventures and Discoveries *still farther South* to which that distressing Calamity gave rise. 12mo.

Paris and the Parisians, in 1835. By Frances Trollope. 8vo. With Engravings.

Traits of the Tea-party; being a Memoir of George R. T. Hewes, one of the Last of its Survivers. With a History of that Transaction; Reminiscences of the Massacre and the Siege, and other Stories of Old Times. By a Bostonian. 18mo. With a Portrait.

An Elementary Treatise on Mechanics. Translated from the French of M. Boucharlat. With Additions and Emendations, designed to adapt it to the use of the Cadets of the U. S Military Academy. By Edward H. Courtenay 8vo. Sheep.

The Life of John Jay; with Selections from his Correspondence and Miscellaneous Papers. By his Son, William Jay. In 2 vols. 8vo. With a Portrait.

Annals of Tryon County; or, the Border Warfare of New-York during the Revolution By W. W. Campbell. 8vo.

A Narrative of Events connected with the Rise and Progress of the Protestant Church in Virginia. To which is added an Appendix, containing the Journals of the Conventions in Virginia from the Commencement to the present Time. By F. L. Hawkes. 8vo.

A Memoir of the Life of William Livingston, Member of Congress in 1774, 1775, and 1776; Delegate to the Federal Convention in 1787, and Governor of the State of New-Jersey from 1776 to 1790. With Extracts from his Correspondence, and Notices of various Members of his Family. By T. Sedgwick, Jun. 8vo. Portrait.

Narrative of an Expedition through the Upper Mississippi to Itasca Lake, the actual Source of this River; embracing an Exploratory Trip through the St. Croix and Burntwood (or Broule) Rivers. By Henry Schoolcraft. 8vo. With Maps.

England and America. A Comparison of the Social and Political State of both Nations.

Sketches of Turkey in 1831 and 1832 By an American. 8vo. With Engravings.

Letters from the Ægean. By James Emerson, Esq. 8vo.

Records of my Life. By John Taylor, Author of "Monsieur Tonson." 8vo

The History of the American Theatre. By William Dunlap. 8vo.

Memoirs of the Duchess d'Abrantes (Madame Junot). 8vo. With a Portrait.

Memoirs of Lucien Bonaparte (Prince of Canino). 12mo.

The Life and Remains of Edward Daniel Clarke. By the Rev. William Otter, A.M., F.L.S. 8vo.

Sketches of the Life and Character of the Rev. Lemuel Haynes, A.M. By Timothy Mather Cooley, D.D. With some Introductory Remarks by Wm. B. Sprague, D.D. 12mo. With a Portrait.

Matthias and his Impostures; or, the Progress of Fanaticism. Illustrated in the Extraordinary Case of Robert Matthews, and some of his Forerunners and Disciples. By William L. Stone. 12mo.

Public and Private Economy. By Theodore Sedgwick. Part First. 12mo.

The Economy of Health; or, the Stream of Human Life from the Cradle to the Grave. With Reflections, Moral, Physical, and Philosophical, on the Septennial Phases of Human Existence. By James Johnson. 18mo.

The Writings of Robert C. Sands, in Prose and Verse. With a Memoir of the Author. In 2 vols. 8vo. With a Portrait.

Literary Remains of the late Henry Neele.

The History of Virgil A. Stewart, and his Adventures in capturing and exposing the Great "Western Land Pirate" and his Gang, in Connexion with the Evidence; also of the Trials, Confessions, and Execution of a Number of Murrell's Associates in the State of Mississippi during the Summer of 1835, and the Execution of five Professional Gamblers by the Citizens of Vicksburg, on the 6th of July, 1835. Compiled by H. R. Howard. 12mo.

Letters, Conversations, and Recollections of the late S. T. Coleridge. 12mo.

Specimens of the Table Talk of the late Samuel Taylor Coleridge. 12mo.

The Religious Opinions and Character of Washington. By Rev. E. C. M'Guire. 12mo.

Protestant Jesuitism. By a Protestant.

Four Years in Great Britain. By Calvin Colton. 12mo.

Thoughts on the Religious State of the Country: with Reasons for preferring Episcopacy. By the Rev. Calvin Colton. 12mo.

Works of Rev. J. Wesley. 10 vols. 8vo.

Christianity Independent of the Civil Government. 12mo.

Help to Faith; or, a Summary of the Evidences of the Genuineness, Authenticity, Credibility, and Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures. By Rev. P. P. Sanford. 12mo.

Lives of the Necromancers; or, an Account of the most Eminent Persons in Successive Ages who have claimed for themselves, or to whom has been imputed by others, the Exercise of Magical Power. By W. Godwin. 12mo.

A Home Tour through the Manufacturing Districts of England. By Sir G. Head. 12mo

The Southwest. By a Yankee. In 2 vols. 12mo.

The Rambler in North America. By Charles Joseph Latrobe, Author of the "Alpenstock," &c. In 2 vols. 12mo.

The Rambler in Mexico. By Charles Joseph Latrobe. 12mo.

Common School Library. First Series.

Common School Library. Second Series. 18mo.

Life of Edmund Kean. By Barry Cornwall. 12mo.

Life of Mrs. Siddons. By Thomas Campbell. 12mo. With a Portrait.

The Life of Wicliff. By Charles Webb le Bas, A.M. 18mo. With a Portrait.

The Life of Archbishop Cranmer. By Charles Webb le Bas, A.M. In 2 vols. 18mo.

The Consistency of the Whole Scheme of Revelation with Itself and with Human Reason. By Philip Nicholas Shuttleworth, D.D.

Luther and the Lutheran Reformation. By the Rev. John Scott, A.M. In 2 vols. 18mo. Portraits.

History of the Reformed Religion in France. By the Rev. Edward Smedley. In 2 vols. 18mo. With Engravings.

A Narrative of the Visit to the American Churches by the Deputation from the Congregational Union of England and Wales. By Andrew Reed, D.D., and James Matheson, D.D. In 2 vols. 12mo.

No Fiction; a Narrative founded on Recent and Interesting Facts. By the Rev Andrew Reed, D.D. New Edition. 12mo.

Martha: a Memorial of an only and beloved Sister. By the Rev. Andrew Reed, Author of "No Fiction." 12mo.

The Mechanic. By Rev. C. B. Tayler.

The District School. By J. Orville Taylor. 18mo.

Constantinople and its Environs. In a Series of Letters, exhibiting the actual State of the Manners, Customs, and Habits of the Turks, Armenians, Jews, and Greeks, as modified by the Policy of Sultan Mahmoud. By an American long resident at Constantinople (Commodore Porter). 2 vols. 12mo.

The Tourist, or a Pocket Manual for Travellers on the Hudson River, the Western Canal and Stage Road to Niagara Falls, down Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence to Montreal and Quebec. Comprising also the Routes to Lebanon, Ballston, and Saratoga Springs 18mo. With a Map.

An Improved Map of the Hudson River, with the Post Roads between New-York and Albany.

The Life of Andrew Jackson, President of the United States of America. By William Cobbett, M.P. 12mo. With a Portrait.

Things as they are; or, Notes of a Traveller through some of the Middle and Northern States. 12mo. With Engravings.

Letters to Young Ladies. By Mrs. L. H Sigourney Third Edition, enlarged 12mo

The Political Grammar of the United States; or, a Complete View of the Theory and Practice of the General and State Governments, with the Relations between them. By Edward D. Mansfield. 12mo.

A Treatise on Language; or, the Relations which Words bear to Things. By A. B. Johnson.

History of Priestcraft in all Ages and Countries. By William Howitt. 12mo.

A Winter in the West. By a New-Yorker. (C. F. Hoffman, Esq.) In 2 vols. 12mo.

France: Social, Literary, and Political. By H. L. Bulwer, Esq., M.P. In 2 vols. 12mo.

Sketches and Eccentricities of Col. David Crockett. 12mo.

Domestic Duties, or Instructions to Young Married Ladies on the Management of their Households, and the Regulation of their Conduct in the various Relations and Duties of Married Life. By Mrs. W. Parkes. With Improvements. 12mo.

Anecdotes of Sir Walter Scott. By the Ettrick Shepherd. With a Life of the Author, by S. Dewitt Bloodgood, Esq. 12mo.

The Life of Baron Cuvier. By Mrs. Lee. 12mo.

Letters to Ada. By the Reverend Dr. Pise. 18mo.

Letters of J. Downing, Major, Downingville Militia, Second Brigade, to his old Friend Mr. Dwight of the New-York Daily Advertiser. 18mo. Engravings.

Scenes in our Parish. By a "Country Parson's" Daughter. 12mo.

The Life, Character, and Literary Labours of Samuel Drew, A.M. By his eldest Son. 12mo.

Observations on Professions, Literature, Manners, and Emigration in the United States and Canada. By the Rev. Isaac Fidler. 12mo.

Cobb's School Books. Including Walker's Dictionary, Explanatory Arithmetic, Nos. 1 and 2, North American Reader, &c.

The Sibyl's Leaves. By Mrs. Coley.

Discourses and Addresses on Subjects of American History, Arts, and Literature. By Gulian C. Verplanck. 12mo.

Narrative of Voyages to explore the Shores of Africa, Arabia, and Madagascar; performed in H.M. Ships Leven and Barracouta, under the Direction of Captain W. F. W. Owen, R.N. In 2 vols. 12mo.

A Treatise on the Millennium; in which the prevailing Theories on that Subject are carefully examined; and the True Scriptural Doctrine attempted to be elicited and established. By George Bush, A.M. 12mo.

A Concordance to the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. By John Brown, of Haddington. 32mo.

The Comforter; or, Extracts selected for the Consolation of Mourners under the Bereavement of Friends and Relations. By A Village Pastor. 12mo.

The Note-book of a Country Clergyman. 18mo

A Table of Logarithms, of Logarithmic Sines, and a Traverse Table. 12mo.

Visits and Sketches at Home and Abroad. With Tales and Miscellanies now first collected, and a New Edition of the "Diary of an Ennuyée." By Mrs. Jameson. In 2 vols. 12mo.

A Subaltern's Furlough: Descriptive of Scenery in various Parts of the United States, Upper and Lower Canada, New-Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, during the Summer and Autumn of 1832. By E. T. Coke, Lieutenant of the 45th Regiment. In 2 vols. 12mo.

Memoirs of General Lafayette and of the French Revolution of 1830. By B. Sarrans, Secretary to General Lafayette. In 2 vols. 12mo.

My Imprisonments: Memoirs of Silvio Pellico Da Saluzzo. Translated from the Italian By Thomas Roscoe. 12mo.

The Life and Death of Lord Edward Fitzgerald. By Thomas More. In 2 vols. 12mo.

Full Annals of the Revolution in France, 1830. To which is added, a Particular Account of the Celebration of said Revolution in the City of New-York on the 25th November, 1830. By Myer Moses. 12mo.

The Condition of Greece. By Col. J. P. Miller. 12mo.

Dramatic Scenes from Real Life. By Lady Morgan. In 2 vols. 12mo.

The Rivals of Este, and other Poems. By J. G. Brooks, and Mary E. Brooks. 12mo.

The Doom of Devorgoil, a Melo Drama Auchindrane; or, the Ayrshire Tragedy. By Sir Walter Scott. 12mo.

The History of the Jews, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time. By the Rev. H. H. Milman. With Engravings, Maps, &c.

The Life of Nelson. By Robert Southey, LL.D. With a Portrait.

The Life of Napoleon Bonaparte. By J. G. Lockhart, Esq. 2 vols. With Portraits.

The Life and Actions of Alexander the Great. By the Rev. J. Williams, A.M. With a Map.

The Natural History of Insects. 2 vols. Engravings.

The Life of Lord Byron. By John Galt, Esq.

The Life of Mohammed, Founder of the Religion of Islam, and of the Empire of the Saracens. By the Rev. George Bush, of New York. Engravings.

Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft. By Sir Walter Scott, Bart. With an Engraving.

History of the Bible. By the Rev G. R. Gleig. With a Map. In 2 vols.

Narrative of Discovery and Adventure in the Polar Seas and Regions. With Illustrations of their Climate, Geology, and Natural History, and an Account of the Whale Fishery. By Professors Leslie and Jameson, and Hugh Murray, Esq. Maps, &c.

The Life and Times of George the Fourth. With Anecdotes of Distinguished Persons of the last Fifty Years By Rev. George Croly.

Narrative of Discovery and Adventure in Africa, from the Earliest Ages to the Present Time. With Illustrations of its Geology, Mineralogy, and Zoology. By Professor Jameson, and James Wilson and Hugh Murray, Esqrs.

Lives of the most Eminent Painters and Sculptors. By Allen Cunningham, Esq. 5 vols. With Portraits.

History of Chivalry and the Crusades. By G. P. R. James, Esq. Engravings.

The Life of Mary Queen of Scots. By Henry Glassford Bell, Esq. 2 vols. With a Portrait.

A View of Ancient and Modern Egypt. With an Outline of its Natural History. By the Rev. M. Russell, LL.D.

History of Poland, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time. By James Fletcher, Esq. With a Portrait.

Festivals, Games, and Amusements, Ancient and Modern. By Horatio Smith, Esq. With Additions, by Samuel Woodworth, Esq., of New-York.

Life of Sir Isaac Newton. By Sir David Brewster, K.B., LL.D., F.R.S. With Engravings.

Palestine, or the Holy Land. From the Earliest Period to the Present Time. By Rev. M. Russell, LL.D.

Memoirs of the Empress Josephine. By John S. Memes, LL.D. With Portraits.

The Court and Camp of Bonaparte. With a Portrait.

Lives and Voyages of Drake, Cavendish, and Dampier. Including an Introductory View of the Earlier Discoveries in the South Seas, and the History of the Bucaniers. With Portraits.

Description of Pitcairn's Island, and its Inhabitants. With an Authentic Account of the Mutiny of the Ship Bounty, and of the subsequent Fortunes of the Mutineers. By J. Barrow, Esq. With Engravings.

Sacred History of the World, as displayed in the Creation and Subsequent Events to the Deluge. Attempted to be Philosophically considered in a Series of Letters to a Son. By Sharon Turner, F.S.A. 3 vols.

Memoirs of Celebrated Female Sovereigns. By Mrs. Jameson. 2 vols.

Journal of an Expedition to Explore the Course and Termination of the Niger. With a Narrative of a Voyage down that River to its Termination. By Richard and John Lander.

Inquiries concerning the Intellectual Powers and the Investigation of Truth. By John Abercrombie, M.D., F.R.S. With Questions.

Lives of Celebrated Travellers. By James Augustus St. John. 3 vols.

Sketches of Venetian History. By the Rev. E. Smedley, M.A. 2 vols. With Engravings.

Indian Biography; or, an Historical Account of those Individuals who have been distinguished among the North American Natives as Orators, Warriors, Statesmen, and other Remarkable Characters. By B. B. Thatcher, Esq. With a Portrait.

Life of Frederic the Second, King of Prussia. By Lord Dover. Portrait. 2 vols.

Historical and Descriptive Account of British India, from the most Remote Period to the Present Time. Including a Narrative of the Early Portuguese and English Voyages, the Revolutions in the Mogul Empire, and the Origin, Progress, and Establishment of the British Power; with Illustrations of the Botany, Zoology, Climate, Geology, and Mineralogy. By Hugh Murray, Esq., James Wilson, Esq., R. K. Greville, LL.D., Whitelaw Ainslie, M.D., William Rhind, Esq., Professor Jameson, Professor Wallace, and Captain Clarence Dalrimple.

Letters on Natural Magic. Addressed to Sir Walter Scott. By Dr. Brewster. With Engravings.

History of Ireland. From the Anglo-Norman Invasion till the Union of the Country with Great Britain. By W. C. Taylor, Esq. With Additions, by William Sampson, Esq. With Engravings. In 2 vols.

Historical View of the Progress of Discovery on the Northern Coasts of North America, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time. By P. F. Tytler, Esq. With Descriptive Sketches of the Natural History of the North American Regions. By Professor Wilson. With a Map, &c.

The Travels and Researches of Alexander Von Humboldt; being a condensed Narrative of his Journeys in the Equinoctial Regions of America, and in Asiatic Russia; together with Analyses of his more important Investigations. By W. Macgillivray, A.M. Engravings.

Letters of Euler on Different Subjects of Natural Philosophy. Addressed to a German Princess. Translated by Hunter. With Notes, and a Life of Euler, by Sir David Brewster; with Additional Notes, by John Griscom, LL.D. With a Glossary of Scientific Terms. With Engravings.

A Popular Guide to the Observation of Nature; or, Hints of Inducement to the Study of Natural Productions and Appearances, in their Connexions and Relations. By Robert Mudie. Engravings.

The Philosophy of the Moral Feelings. By John Abercrombie, M.D., F.R.S. With Questions.

On the Improvement of Society by the Diffusion of Knowledge. By Thos. Dick, LL.D.

History of Charlemagne. To which is prefixed an Introduction, comprising the History of France from the Earliest Period to the Birth of Charlemagne. By G. P. R. James. With a Portrait.

Nubia and Abyssinia. Comprehending the Civil History, Antiquities, Arts, Religion, Literature, and Natural History. By the Rev. M. Russell, LL.D. With a Map and Engravings.

The Life of Oliver Cromwell. By the Rev. M. Russell, LL.D. Portrait. In 2 vols.

Lectures on General Literature, Poetry, &c. By James Montgomery.

An Historical Account of the Circumnavigation of the Globe, and of the Progress of Discovery in the Pacific Ocean, from the Voyage of Magellan to the Death of Cook. With numerous Engravings.

This book is due two weeks from the last date stamped below, and if not returned or renewed at or before that time a fine of five cents a day will be incurred.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
0315024652

931 M8542
3